AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAY CRITICISM OF SCHOOL SERVICES AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN SELECTED HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SCHOOLS

By

NORMAN L. TRAINOR

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1980

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My most special thanks to Dr. James Hale who chaired my committee. His help, guidance, and thoughtfulness greatly exceeded the normal requirements of a committee chairman.

My thanks also to Dr. James L. Wattenbarger and Dr. Robert R. Sherman for serving on the supervisory committee and for their contributions to my education.

The time and technical expertise given by Steve Smith and Jim Jacobi were very helpful and much appreciated.

The encouragement and suggestions given by my friends, Vilma Vega and Marcie Kittner, were timely and helpful, and I am grateful for both their help and their friendship.

To my wife, Rhonda, I wish to extend the special thanks reserved for those who give so much of themselves for others. Her time and technical skills were invaluable, as have been her support, inspiration, enlightenment, and assistance over the years.

Finally, I want to thank those family members and friends that have always had kind words of faith and encouragement. To them, I am grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ---------------------------------- ii

LIST OF TABLES ------------------------------------ v

ABSTRACT --- vii

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION ------------------------------ 1

Background ---------------------------------- 2
Statement of the Problem ------------------ 9
Questions ---------------------------------- 10
Definition of Terms ----------------------- 10
Procedures --------------------------------- 13
Sample ------------------------------------- 15
Delimitations ----------------------------- 16
Justification ----------------------------- 17
Limitations ------------------------------- 18
Organization of the Research Report ------- 20

II A REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND OPINIONS ---------------------------------- 21

The Public's Attitude Toward Public Schools in General ------------------- 22
Curriculum and Student Achievement -------- 38
Discipline and Student Achievement -------- 42
Personnel and Student Achievement --------- 45
Physical Facilities and Student Achievement -------------------------- 47
Open Education vs. Traditional Education -- 50
Conclusions ------------------------------- 53

III ANALYSIS OF THE DATA --------------------- 55

Parental Attitude Scores ------------------ 56
Summary ----------------------------------- 70

Page

IV SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS --- 72

Summary
The Relationship Between Parental Attitude Toward Type of School and Student Achievement ------------- 72
The Relationship Between the Parental Attitude Variables of Curriculum, Discipline, Personnel, Physical Facilities and Student Achievement -- 75
The Relationship Between Parental Attitude Variables, Curriculum, Discipline, Personnel and Physical Facilities ------------------------- 78
Conclusions ------------------------------- 80
Recommendations --------------------------- 85

APPENDICES

A GLOBAL ACHIEVEMENT SCORES FOR OPEN AND TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS ------------------------ 88

B RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ---------------- 97

C PARENT OPINION SURVEY --------------------- 110

REFERENCES -- 115

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH ------------------------------- 119

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Items Most Frequently Cited as Biggest Problems in the Eight Annual Polls	25
2	Global Achievement Scores for Open Schools	57
3	Global Achievement Scores for Traditional Schools	58
4	Parental Attitude Survey for Students in Open Schools	60
5	Parental Attitude Survey for Students in Traditional Schools	61
6	Correlation of Global Achievement Scores with Parental Attitude Scores	62
7	Comparison of Parental Attitude Variable Discipline with the Variables Curriculum, Personnel, and Physical Facilities	64
8	Comparison of the Parental Attitude Variable Personnel with the Variables Curriculum and Physical Facilities	66
9	Comparison of the Parental Attitude Variable Curriculum with Variable Physical Facilities	68
10	Chi-Square Analysis of the Relationship Between the Parental Attitude Variables, Achievement, and the Type of Learning Environment--Open or Traditional	71
A-1	Global Achievement Scores for Open Schools	88
A-2	Global Achievement Scores for Traditional Schools	92

Table Page

B-1 Response to Questionnaire--Open Schools 97

B-2 Response to Questionnaire--Traditional Schools 103

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAY CRITICISM OF SCHOOL SERVICES AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN SELECTED HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SCHOOLS

By

Norman L. Trainor
December, 1980

Chairman: James A. Hale
Major Department: Education Administration and Supervision

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between parents' attitude toward the school's curriculum, discipline, personnel, physical facilities and student achievement in selected open and traditional elementary schools in Hillsborough County, Florida.

The data were also examined to determine if any similarities existed in the parents' attitude toward the different school characteristics themselves and to see if any differences existed in these attitudes where the school was open or traditional in its organization.

The sample consisted of 24 elementary schools in Hillsborough County, Florida. Of these, 12 were open and 12 were traditional.

Global achievement scores were obtained from the 1977 county-wide testing with the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, and they reflected the combined growth of all the students in the target schools.

These global achievement scores were compared to the parental attitude scores with the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Technique. Of the 15 relationships examined, six were found to be statistically significant and nine were nonsignificant.

Parental attitude scores are the results of a questionnaire utilized by the target schools to determine parents' feelings for the Fifth Annual Report of School Progress.

A chi-square analysis of the data was also done to compare school type with each of the variables to establish if parental attitudes differed between open and traditional schools.

Several relationships were found to be statistically significant. These were:

1. Parents' attitude toward physical facilities and the type of school. The chi-square for this relationship was 16.666; the significance was .00004.
2. Parents' attitude toward physical facilities and student achievement. The correlation coefficient for this relationship was positive, $r = .4566$ and $p < .05$.

3. Parents' attitude toward curriculum related to their attitude toward discipline and personnel. Both correlations are positive, with $r = .5512$, $p < .05$ in the first case, and $r = .5586$, $p < .05$ in the second case.
4. Parents' attitude toward discipline related to their attitude toward personnel. This relationship was positive; $r = .6064$, $p < .05$.
5. Parents' attitude toward discipline related to their attitude toward physical facilities. This relationship was positive; $r = .5141$ and $p < .05$.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The typical American adult has developed a genuine affection for his/her school. Historically, the one-room country school was the only public building for miles around. It provided a meeting place for various community and civic groups as well as school-related organizations. School activities often were the entertainment and focal centers of the season and provided one of the major sources of social activity for students and adults. As communities and schools grew, the involvement of one with the other became more entwined. What adult today has not cheered his/her team to victory, has not attended or participated in the annual fall festival, or reminisced about some mischievous episodes of his/her school days? This close relationship schools have with their constituents is continued from generation to generation and evolves with the changing needs and times of the school and community.

Parental and community involvement in the school has expanded to many aspects of the school system. Parent organizations, civic groups and interested citizens have undertaken projects to change curriculum and instructional materials, renovate school buildings, and improve facilities in general. Because parental involvement in schools returns such tremendous dividends in terms of community support and rapport, it is much sought after by teachers and administrators alike. Parental involvement in school activities has many benefits. Fund raising for special projects is a very visible return. Less visible, but equally important, are the volunteers that work in the schools and the opportunity for school/community communication that is a natural outgrowth of this close contact.

Parental involvement in school activities may at times create situations where diverse opinions of the school patrons must be evaluated, integrated, and implemented into the school curriculum. When a compromise is not a viable solution, the school administrator must make a decision that will maximize student achievement.

The purpose of this study is to report research that examined the relationships between parental attitude toward various aspects of the school and the achievement, in reading and mathematics, of students attending the school.

Background

During the middle 1960's, Hillsborough County Public Schools began incorporating into their elementary school program changes which included team-teaching, nongrading, and multiage groupings. This period of experimentation and innovation came also at a time when the school district piloted differentiated staffing concepts and designed programs for students with special learning needs.

Many of the pilot projects of that period provided both rationale and data for the planning of new schools and new instructional programs. Some of these programs failed to meet the expectations of their planners and have been terminated. However, a great number of the instructional strategies developed during that period have been incorporated into the instructional program and are in use today.

Many parents have been reluctant to accept changes in the schools. They have voiced their opposition openly and strongly, often influencing school administrators and board members. For example, a new elementary school opened in eastern Hillsborough County in August, 1979. This school was originally designed utilizing the open-space concept, instructionally and architecturally. Parental dissatisfaction with this openness has resulted in a redesigned facility with semipermanent walls and an instructional orientation toward a more traditional philosophy. Historically, whether for the good or ill, parental attitudes have had considerable influence on school instructional programs. In many instances books, both library and text, have been forced out of or into the schools.

Many times when normal channels of change have been unproductive, parents have sought changes in the school by seeking the intervention in school board policy and practice by the courts. These efforts have not gone unchallenged by other parents. In the case of Steven A. Pico v. Board of Education, Island Trees Union Free School District, the right of the school board to remove certain books from the school library and curriculum was challenged unsuccessfully. In Minarcini v. Strongsville City School District, the court ruled that the removal of certain books from the school library was an infringement on the First Amendment rights of students and ordered them returned. In a similar dispute, Presidents Council District 25 v. Community School Board No. 25, the court ruled that the First Amendment was not violated by the school board's resolution requiring removal of a particular book from junior high school libraries.

These cases reflect the strong involvement of parents in the operation of the schools. Programs have been included or excluded from the curriculum, and teachers and administrators have been compelled to resign or relocate as a direct result of parental criticism of the schools. Most educators who have been involved in public education for any length of time have had opportunities to witness the power of parental criticism.

Administrators cannot simply acquiesce to parental criticism or caustically disregard it without causing the decision-makers concern as to whether they made the correct decision and gave appropriate consideration to parental suggestions. This would appear to be true whether parental attitudes were in opposition or agreement with those of the decision-makers. Sealy (1977) discussed the possibility that parental input, while valuable, may not always be in the best interest of the child. Speaking to the topic of groupings in a self-contained classroom, he said,

> If classrooms are to be self-contained, the composition of any class will need careful consideration, and it may not be in the best interest of the child to bow completely to the parental choice. (p. 64)

Sealy's point that parental choice may not always be consistent with the needs of the child is a justifiable concern and one that needs to be explored if practicing educators are to evaluate parental input correctly and incorporate their suggestions into the planning and development of programs.

If school administrators seek approval from their critics by yielding to their demands, they may find that they have simultaneously acquired the wrath of other critics of a different mind. There are almost as many opinions as there are parents and interested citizens about some school issues. Barth (1978) noted,

> Parents are not a homogeneous block with a single set of values and desires. In fact I have found parents to be of as many minds as bodies. To comply with the demands of a few parents (usually those who are shouting the loudest) often means violating the wishes of other parents (and many teachers) and pitting parent against parent in the process. (p. 54)

A problem school administrators must often resolve is to ascertain which parental voices among the conflicting opinions that offer input into the school policy-making process are reflective of opinions that have the most promising effect on student development. Minority opinions that are not in line with the thinking of school administrators and the majority of the public should be heard and evaluated by criteria based on the best interest of children.

School personnel are very concerned about the public's attitude toward schools for several reasons. As public servants most are aware that the taxpayer, through his elected officials, is the employer. Of a greater concern to most educators, however, is the realization that they can do their job better when parents are aware of school activities, are involved in them, and lend their support to these endeavors.

Davies (1978), after interviewing some 350 citizens, educators, and policy-makers, concluded that citizen participation is education's newest fad, and was being given only verbal or token support by those with decision-making power. He said,

> I am alarmed that a powerful idea is being transformed into trivial practice, and that the lack of substantive reform is showing through the patina of rhetoric. (p. 2)

The problem, as Davies saw it, was that despite the new organizations that foster parental involvement, little actual power has been transferred. Court-ordered desegregation was followed by court-mandated citizen involvement. This action by parents, seeking involvement in the schools through the courts, may not be the most effective means since it does nothing to enhance school/community relations. Davies concluded that

> Citizen participation is an essential part of empowering the powerless, revitalizing grassroots democracy, and creating a more equitable, just society. (p. 5)

The 1973 Florida Legislature required that each school make a report to parents or guardians of the education progress made during the school year. This report focuses on student achievement in reading, mathematics, and language and also surveys parental attitude toward the school's curriculum, discipline, personnel, and physical facilities.

Smith and Gallup (1977) report that

> Each of these dimensions of public education have appeared in the past to be among the aspects of education of greatest concern to parents. (p. 10)

The diverse value-structures of homes result in different standards of discipline for children. These are reflected in the attitudes of school children and their parents and often cause disagreements between parents and school personnel as to what discipline standards should be maintained in the schools. Also, since the days of the Blue Laws it seems evident that members of the public have expected higher moral and intellectual standards for teachers than they have imposed on themselves. A result of this public concern with school personnel was the establishment of standards of employment, procedures for attainment of tenure, and rules of personal and professional conduct, the violation of which could result in dismissal.

Further, the curriculum of the public schools evolves as the needs of society change. Often parents who have daily contacts in the business world are more aware of changing curriculum needs than educators. School officials look to parents for guidance through their participation on advisory boards, and to parents individually regarding what course work is most beneficial to students. Finally, public concern with the facilities of schools not only relates to the comfort and well-being of children, but more recently, there appears to be concern that the physical facilities have an impact on the curriculum and discipline of the school. Many parents and educators are concerned about the implications and results of the open-school concept.

The trend toward use of open space in schools is a combination economy move and an attempt to meet more adequately individual learning needs of students. Open facilities offer many opportunities for economy. The building *per se* is less expensive to construct and maintain, and the absence of walls makes for more efficient heating and cooling. Instructionally, materials may be more easily shared, maximizing their usage and reducing the quantities needed per pupil. However, with regard to meeting individual learning needs of students, research evidence offers mixed results when open-space organizations were compared to traditional classrooms (Doobs, 1974; Reynolds, 1974; Lukasevich and Gray, 1978).

Many educators and parents have voiced opposition to the open facilities and have indicated a desire to retain the traditional-type facility that stresses the basic self-contained classroom. These educators and parents believe the structure and teaching techniques found in the traditional classroom are the most conducive to learning. Literature that examines open and traditional schools is reviewed in Chapter II.

One of the issues professional educators must deal with is that of examining the basic attitude of the public in regard to the various aspects of education, especially as these attitudes relate to implementing programs that result in the greatest amount of student achievement.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the relationships, if any, that exist between parental attitude toward school curriculum, discipline, personnel, and physical facilities and student achievement in reading and mathematics. These relationships were examined in two types of school settings--open and traditional.

Questions

To aid in the investigation, answers to the following specific questions were sought:

1. What is the parents' attitude toward school curriculum, discipline, personnel and physical facilities in the target elementary schools?
2. What is the achievement in reading and mathematics of the students in the target schools?
3. What is the statistical relationship between parental attitude toward the school curriculum, discipline, personnel, physical facilities, and student achievement in the target schools?
4. Is the relationship between parental attitude toward curriculum, discipline, personnel, physical facilities and student achievement greater in open or traditionally organized schools?

Definition of Terms

Many of the terms used in this study are common to the education profession and need no elaboration. Others appear to be somewhat ambiguous and may need clarification.

In order to ensure that readers gain the same interpretation from this study, the following definitions of selected terms are offered.

Annual Report of School Progress. This report is required under provisions contained in Chapter 73-388, Section 26-32, Laws of Florida. The 1973 Legislature required each school to make a report to each parent or guardian of the educational progress made by the school during the school year. Data for this study were drawn from the Fifth Annual Report of School Progress 1977-78 for the target populations.

Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Expanded Edition, is a series of examinations for children enrolled in kindergarten through grade twelve. According to the instruction manual, the examinations consist of seven overlapping areas and are nationally normed by grade level. "Test items should be answered as readily by students taught according to a traditional approach as by those who are taught according to any of the newer approaches" ("Comprehensive Test, 1974", p. 1).

Curriculum. For the purposes of this research, the term "curriculum" refers to the subject matter taught and the methods and materials used to carry out this instruction.

Parental Attitude. This concept refers to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of parents toward each aspect of schooling being examined. Parental attitude data are collected as a part of the Annual Report of School Progress. Questionnaires are sent home to randomly selected parents asking them to agree or disagree with a series of positively worded statements about each of the aspects of school being examined. The results are expressed as the percentage of parents agreeing with the positive statements.

Open Schools. Open schools are of two basic types in Hillsborough County, Florida. One design utilizes "pods," or single rooms large enough to hold all the classes for each grade level (or team), consisting of approximately 100 to 150 children. The other type has one large area for the entire primary grades (1 to 3) of the school and a similar area for the intermediate grades (4 to 6). Each area houses between 400 and 450 students in these plants. "Open schools," as used in this paper, refers to these two architectural designs and an organizational pattern incorporating a team of teachers working with large numbers of pupils in such facilities.

Scaled Scores. The Expanded Standard Scores (scaled scores) are produced from a single, equal interval scale of scores across all grades for use with all levels of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. The Expanded Standard Score is expressed in three-digit numbers, ranging from 000 to 999. These scaled scores enable the user to chart a student's growth from the beginning of school through grade 12, regardless of which level of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Schools that has been administered.

Traditional Schools. The term "traditional schools," as used in this paper, refers to those schools architecturally designed with individual classrooms enrolling approximately 30 students in each classroom. Instructional strategies vary from the typical self-contained, single-teacher approach to variations which include homogeneous groupings and team teaching.

Procedures

This was a descriptive study of the existing conditions in a sample of Hillsborough County, Florida, public schools. Data for this study were drawn from the Fifth Annual Report of School Progress (1977-78) and the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills results.

A global achievement score for each school was obtained as follows: (1) The number of students taking the examination at each grade level was multiplied by the mean scaled score for that grade level to obtain a gross score for each grade level; (2) The gross scores for each grade level were summed to obtain a gross score for the school; and (3) The gross score for the school was divided by the total number of students in the school taking the examination to provide the global achievement score for the school.

The measures of parental attitude utilized in this study are determined by the percentages of favorable responses to a number of positive statements related to each variable being examined. The questionnaire containing these statements was the survey instrument utilized in the Fifth Annual Report of School Progress. The survey was sent to randomly selected parents of children in each target school. Parents were afforded the opportunity to agree or disagree with each statement or to respond, "Don't know." Computation of the percentage of parents in agreement with the positive statements was made by the Office of Comprehensive Planning.

The Spearman rank order correlation technique utilizing the formula $\text{rho} = \frac{1-\Sigma D^2}{N(N^2-1)}$ was used to examine the strength of relationships between parental attitude and student achievement.

A correlation between the global achievement scores for each school in both groups, and the positive statements concerning curriculum, discipline, personnel, and physical facilities was used to evaluate the questions posed.

Correlation of the percentage scores of the four variables with each other was also made to identify the strength of relationships that may exist between the variables themselves. Also, the global achievement scores of the two groups were tested to determine their differences, if any.

An additional test, the chi-square test, was used to determine the strength of relationships between the variables and school types. A 2 x 2 contingency table was used to establish the number of schools which fall into each category. The chi-square analysis of these cells indicated the possibilities of such a distribution happening by chance. The .05 level of significance was selected for this test with 1 degree of freedom. The critical value for χ^2 .95 with one degree of freedom equals 3.84.

Sample

The sample population utilized in this study was drawn from the Hillsborough County, Florida, public schools. During the 1977-78 school year, Hillsborough County operated the 21st largest school system in the United States. The 20th day enrollment figures for that year totaled 114,278 students in grades kindergarten through adult programs. Programs ranged from kindergarten and headstart to adult education. A variety of vocational-technical programs were offered to high school and adult students. Elementary diagnostic and remediation programs were generally available in reading and mathematics as well as grades one through six academic classes.

The Public Information Office of the school system reports a total of 15,029 persons were employed in permanent instructional, permanent noninstructional, temporary, and substitute positions to operate a total of 130 schools. These 130 schools consisted of 92 elementary schools (some kindergarten through five, some kindergarten through six, and some sixth grade only.) There were 26 junior high schools (some grades seven through nine, some grades eight and nine, and some seventh grade only.) The 11 senior high schools in the county were all grades 10-12. The county also operated one ungraded, trainable mentally handicapped school.

The target population of this study was drawn from the 92 elementary schools. Of these 92 schools, 12 are open-space in their design. The data from these 12 schools were used to ascertain parental attitude and student achievement in open-space schools.

Of the remaining 80 schools, two offered a combination of open and traditional instructional strategies. These were excluded from the study.

The 78 traditionally organized elementary schools remaining were alphabetically ordered. Using a drawn-number technique, a group of 12 was randomly selected. This group constituted the sample of traditionally organized schools used in this study.

Delimitations

The major delimitation of this study is with the sample. All schools were not utilized. The sample was restricted to the open-design elementary schools and an equal number of randomly selected traditionally organized elementary schools in Hillsborough County, Florida.

A further delimitation is reflected in the data. Test scores and parental attitude data are for the 1977-78 school year only.

Justification

A limited amount of money for the funding of schools is combined with increasing public demand for more effective educational programs. School administrators must make choices from a multitude of building designs and a variety of instructional programs.

Parental attitude toward the schools is the product of many variables. The relative cost of the service schools provide, compared to the dividends earned as a result of this service, may be a factor in many parents' attitude toward the schools. School administrators should be mindful of the impact of educational decisions on the public's attitude toward the schools when educational planning is done.

As parent groups become increasingly vocal, there appears to be a need for a study that would suggest the relationship between parental attitude toward various dimensions of public education and student achievement. The absence of a study indicating the relationship between parental attitude and student achievement could result in school administrators catering to very vocal minorities to the detriment of the goals of the school, or not being responsive to concerns that may, in fact, have an impact on student achievement.

This study attempted to relate the concerns of parents with the related objectives of the school (i.e., student achievement) to determine the extent of the relationship (if any) between parental attitude and student achievement. It may provide school administrators with insights to issues that they must deal with when making decisions concerning new construction and the development of programs within these and existing facilities.

Limitations

The previously noted delimitations create an overall limitation restricting the results of this study to populations like the one studied.

Other limitations are with the data. The Fifth Annual Report of School Progress reports the results of survey questionnaires sent to randomly selected parents in each school's attendance area. It is believed by this researcher that those parents with strong feelings are more likely to complete and return questionnaires than those not having strong feelings. This factor probably creates a bias in the sample population. Further, the survey questionnaire asks the respondent to agree or disagree with certain positive statements representing limited areas of school activities and policies. Concerns beyond the scope of these statements may or may not be reflected in the responses.

The variance in home environments, school environments, and individual testing situations of each student, combined with the limitations of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, may restrict the accuracy of achievement data.

The open schools utilized in this study are newer schools, many of which are located in developing subdivisions where the students may come from more affluent, better-educated parents who can provide more nonschool experiences and guidance for their children. Also, instructional materials are generally newer and perhaps more plentiful in these schools. The schools are air-conditioned, carpeted, and seem more conducive to learning than many of the traditional facilities with which they are compared. These environmental factors may have some impact on the global achievement scores.

Robb and Turney (1973) have computed tables indicating the level of significance for values of r' (rank-order correlation coefficient). According to their table, the small sample size approaches the lower limits of validity of the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Technique making it somewhat insensitive to minor fluctuations of the data (p. 201).

Organization of the Research Report

Chapter II contains a review of related opinions and research which examine the public's general opinion toward the public schools and, specifically, their attitude toward curriculum, discipline, personnel, and physical facilities. Chapter III is a documentation of the data compiled to conduct this study. Chapter IV reports the findings and conclusions of this research and gives recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND OPINIONS

The number of problems that have confronted educators over the decades has been researched and editorialized extensively. As a result of these efforts, a sizable body of research and opinions has evolved. The topic with which this study is concerned is related to a portion of this literature. The basic purpose of this chapter is to review the literature which has examined parental attitudes toward various aspects of public education and the relationships of those attitudes to student achievement. Research and opinions which have examined the relationships between the school curriculum and student achievement, school discipline and student achievement, school personnel and student achievement, and school physical facilities and student achievement are particularly germane. These aspects of education and their relationship to achievement will be examined in both open and traditional classroom environments. Research and opinions which have examined achievement and parental attitude in open and traditional environments will also be reviewed.

Before specific variables are discussed in this chapter the reader is introduced to a review of literature which suggests what the collective attitude of the public is toward its schools. Surveys have been completed each year since 1969 to ascertain the public's attitude in general toward public schools. The data from these surveys suggest the presence of somewhat consistent attitudes and trends in the public's overall feelings toward the schools.

Literature examining the variables of curriculum, discipline, personnel, and physical facilities and their relationship to student achievement is reviewed thereafter. The chapter is concluded with a review of research and opinions which examine the relative merits of the open classroom and the traditional classroom.

The Public's Attitude Toward Public Schools in General

In many cities around the nation, voters have not taxed themselves to improve the schools. Many times the schools have closed before the public voted to increase funding. Bond issues whose revenue would be used to improve the schools are often defeated at the polls. These very visible rejections of school needs suggest that those Americans are not satisfied with, or supportive of, the schools.

The strong impact of vested interest groups on the political system which controls the public schools may give direction to the system that is not reflective of the public in general. The loudest, most persistent voices are often heard and followed, but they may not always be indicative of the majority opinion.

Smith and Gallup (1977) summarize eight years of polling that suggests what the public's attitude is toward the schools. Their findings indicate the cursory observations described previously which show a lack of public confidence in the schools is not consistent with the feelings of a substantial majority of Americans. They feel that overall the polls show an unusual consistency in the public's attitude toward the schools. They found a high degree of public confidence in the schools and the citizens were willing to accept new ideas from the schools. A remarkable patience with the schools' shortcomings was noted as well as a strong desire to share responsibilities (p. 6).

Trends that were noticed in the first five years of polling were discussed by Smith & Gallup (1977). They observed that even though the nation as a whole was passing through a period of disillusionment brought on by the war in Vietnam, Watergate, student strife, and racial unrest, the public schools retained the high level of public trust and respect they have enjoyed in the past. He said,

> Education in the United States is still widely regarded as the royal road to success in life. At the same time, a few clouds are appearing on the horizon; unless those who are interested in the continued strength and well-being of the public schools heed those portents, public education in the nation could face a worrisome future. (p. 6)

Gallup continued by pointing to the fact that the public has a "shocking lack of information about the public schools." He suggested that schools suffer from "poor press" and further noted that, "Usually the good news will go neglected unless school administrators themselves take the trouble to find it and see that it is dealt with in an interesting and informative manner" (p. 6).

When we consider that most Americans get information about their schools from either the students in the schools or from newspapers, Gallup indicates the attitudes of the students must be favorable, since the most striking feature of the polls is the deep and continued confidence of the public in its schools. Gallup believes this confidence does not stem from the press or media in general but comes from information gained first-hand in the schools. He said,

> The picture from the 8 polls is of citizens who have confidence in their schools, who place the blame for children's poor experiences in school and for declining test scores on other agencies, and who wish to share the responsibility for solving the schools' major problems. (p. 7)

Table 1 from Smith and Gallup's work summarizes very clearly the most frequently cited problem of the eight annual polls reviewed.

Table 1

Items Most Frequently Cited as Biggest Problems in the Eight Annual Polls

Rank	Problem	Percentage
	1969	
1	Discipline	26%
2	Facilities	22%
3	Teachers	17%
4	Finances	14%
5	Integration	13%
	1970	
1	Discipline	18%
2	Integration	17%
3	Finances	17%
4	Teachers	12%
5	Facilities	11%
6	Drugs	11%
	1971	
1	Finances	23%
2	Integration	21%
3	Discipline	14%
4	Facilities	13%
5	Drugs	12%
6	Teachers	11%
	1972	
1	Discipline	23%
2	Finances	19%
3	Integration	18%
4	Teachers	14%

Table 1 continued

Rank	Problem	Percentage
	1973	
1	Discipline	22%
2	Integration	18%
3	Finances	16%
4	Teachers	13%
5	Drugs	10%
	1974	
1	Discipline	23%
2	Integration	16%
3	Finances	13%
4	Drugs	13%
5	Teachers	11%
	1975	
1	Discipline	23%
2	Integration	15%
3	Finances	14%
4	Teachers	11%
5	Size of School/Classes	10%
6	Drugs	9%
	1976	
1	Discipline	22%
2	Integration	15%
3	Finances	14%
4	Curriculum	14%
5	Drugs	11%
6	Teachers	11%

It is evident from these findings that with the exception of curriculum, the aspects of school with which this paper deals have long been significant concerns of parents. Discipline was listed as the most pressing problem in seven of the eight years. Personnel, listed as teachers in the table, was also named in each of the eight surveys. Physical facilities was named three times and curriculum was named once as being pressing problems in the public schools.

Another area addressed in this paper is the concept of "open" and closed, or traditional, classrooms. According to Smith & Gallup (1977), the opening question in the 1975 poll was, "Do you happen to know what is meant by the open school concept or idea?" Surprisingly, after more than a decade of publicity on the open school and the open classroom, only 27 percent said they knew what was meant by open schools; 60 percent did not know; 13 percent were not sure. Of the 27 percent who knew, about half (13 percent) approved of open schools and 10 percent disapproved with 4 percent "don't know" or "no answer" (p. 16).

An interesting aspect of the studies is the apparent lack of concern of the public with the primary goal of the school, which is student achievement. It is possible that the poll was designed in a fashion not to suggest achievement as an area of concern, or that it is an area assumed by parents to be the result of other areas chosen.

Achievement is very much an area of concern of professional critics.

Bard (1976) cites several instances where students appear to be less prepared today than they were a few years ago. Commenting on Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, he reported a decline every year since 1962 with the decline more severe since 1968. Referring to competency standards currently being stressed, he noted that most are low. He said, "When students are required to pass a competency exam to graduate from high school, that usually means competency at the eighth grade level, not the twelfth in reading and arithmetic" (p. 63). Therefore, competency standards should be considered only a beginning.

Sabol (1976) quotes William Angoff's observations about standardized achievement test scores:

> To attribute the score declining to a deterioration of the educational system is to neglect the other highly persuasive educational influences outside the formal educational environment and more generally to ignore the broad complexity of the human learning process and the interaction of myriad factors that affect it. (p. 7)

Angoff appears to believe that the criticism of achievement scores is not based on a comprehensive examination of the educational program of the schools. Sabol quotes Angoff once again when he cites studies that show "No decline, but instead a slight rise in the performance of high school juniors," and a similar improvement for lower-grade students on a variety of standardized tests. Angoff concludes, "Some lines of objective evidence support the contention that the quality of American education has not declined" (p. 7).

Another writer to whom Sabol refers is *National Observer's* Steve Duscha. About a California "Early Childhood Education Project," Duscha reported that "Reading and language skills showed an average 11 months' education gain for each 10 months of instruction" (p. 7). Sabol summarized with this comment:

> This is no time to be smug. But there is far from conclusive evidence that we have been as incompetent or ineffective as the alarmists cry. Somebody out there must be doing something right. (p. 7)

Others have voiced a belief that the schools are successfully meeting their challenge. Comparing 1950 with 1978, Farmer (1979) noted a change in attitudes and concerns of parents. He quoted a Roper Poll conducted in 1950 that showed 33 percent of the public was satisfied with the schools. A Gallup Poll in 1978 showed an increase to 37 percent. Although this increase is not a significant improvement in 28 years, Farmer pointed out that parents' expectations for the schools have become greater. A poll devised in 1950 by *Life Magazine* and Educational Testing Service was used to rate schools as "Best in the Country," "Average in the Country," and "Worst in the Country." Farmer applied the test to the 130 schools in Hillsborough

County, Florida. If there was a doubt that any school could not meet the criteria, he answered "No" for the system. The results indicated every school in the county met the standard "Best in the Country" (p. 8).

It has been said that a pessimist views a glass of water as half empty and an optimist views it as half full. So it is with information gleaned from numbers. Most of the time numbers can be interpreted in more than one way, and often what is not said has as much meaning as what is said. Floyd (1978) interpreted the Gallup Polls as indicating that over 80 percent of American parents of school-age children are at least fairly well satisfied with the current quality of public education. She quotes a study recently completed in Florida where the parents of 4,545 children in grades 1 through 12 in eight counties were interviewed. Eighty-two percent of these parents were satisfied with their schools. Analysis of these results indicated a significant different among parents. These differences were related to race, education, and socioeconomic status. The strongest relationship was between satisfaction and race. Black parents tended to be better satisfied than did white parents. The more formal education the parents had, the less they tended to be satisfied, and the upper socioeconomic categories were less satisfied than lower socioeconomic categories (p. 356).

Berry (1978) noted trends that are currently developing in education that are good, but are not by themselves solutions to all educational problems. Competency-based education, for example, must include in its definition not only teaching students to read, add, and count, but also include history and civilization. Students must learn about culture and the sciences. Berry argues against those who would not teach such life competencies, because they cannot be tested, with the statement, "Not all important skills are relevant to standardized testing" (p. 1965). As support for this contention, she quotes a Washington Post columnist who described a study of children who had succeeded against all the obstacles poverty can create. They succeeded because their families had taught them that poverty was a circumstance like the weather, not a definition of who they are or what they might become. Berry summarized with this thought:

> The solution to educational failure, and the pursuit of educational excellence, must begin at home, and must continue in the local school. (p. 1975)

Roper (1978) quoted a nationwide public opinion poll commissioned by the National Education Association that found three-quarters of the American population expressed confidence of some degree in American public education. Only 15 percent expressed a lack of confidence in teachers. Substantially less confidence was shown toward school boards, the entities responsible for proposing and disposing of budgets and other educational policies.

The poll suggested a lack of public knowledge about what goes on inside of schools and a strong desire to become better informed. It also indicated that when choosing a neighborhood in which to live, good schools were placed ahead of everything except a clean neighborhood. There was a clear mandate to return to basic education, and an overwhelming majority expressed that the demands on teachers are greater today than ever before.

Despite a decline in educational quality, virtually all segments of society viewed teachers as competent, well trained, and interested in their communities. Many more items of public support for teachers and education in the article showed a clear mandate for teachers to take their case to the public and involve their communities in the struggle for academic excellence.

Woodring (1978) discussed the similarity between the criticisms of today with those of 1950. Interestingly, the problems and concerns are virtually the same. He suggested that we should be able to learn from our past, but critics seem to be unaware of the history of educational criticism. He pointed out that much of the criticism of today's public education is answerable. Since testmakers use the term "norm" instead of average, it is obvious that half of the nation's students fall below the norm.

Criticism of public schools appears to be primarily centered around the fact that schools have assumed too much responsibility, much of which should be placed elsewhere. He describes a situation where,

> Schoolmen stole more gold than they could carry. A period of the last twenty years has disclosed a spectacle of public education driven to its knees beneath that misappropriated weight. Schools have stumbled into a clamorous decline under the burden of responsibility which families bore with quiet dignity for all preceding generations. (Woodring, 1978, p. 324)

Teachers often respond to critics with counterattacks at everything from poor home environments of students, the influence of television, and the public's lack of awareness of the multitude of conflicting social pressures under which students and teachers operate.

There are about 2.2 million public school teachers in the United States who are increasingly receiving failing grades from the public they serve, according to Sanoff (1978). Teacher unions have forced an increase in both teacher salaries and parental criticism. The public is increasingly holding teachers responsible for results in children's learning. Teacher tenure laws are pointed to as vehicles on which mediocre or poor teachers get on and ride for years (p. 2).

"Not within recent memory have the public schools had so few friends or so many detractors," according to Hechinger (1979, p. 20). In a recent Saturday Review article, he stated that the cost of education has increased 150 percent. Meanwhile, achievement has been declining. He estimated 13 percent of all public high school graduates are functionally illiterate. The problems as he sees them are many. Declining growth rates are being paralleled by increased costs and reduced efficiency. An aging population is beginning to look upon schools as a burden instead of a boon. "Fiscal conservatism is buoyed by the back to basics movement, which does not stop with a sensible insistence on better teaching, and more successful learning of basic skills" (p. 21). Conservative advocates are anxious to remove frills such as art and music to reduce expenses.

Hechinger suggested several changes that must be made. Failure to do so will, according to him, lead to a stratified society reminiscent of an earlier time when the public schools received only the most deprived students. He recommended changes in teacher preparation to a more professional approach of training teachers in the classroom with students and a need for an awareness on the part of the American public toward the link between public schools and democracy must be attained. Finally, Hechinger recommended that the establishment of a national coalition for public education whose mission would be the propagation of faith in public schools as the foundation of democracy. This need to build faith in the schools is a familiar theme. Kilpatrick (1978) says, "The problem at bottom is quite simply a problem of confidence" (p. 13).

It appears there is a difference of opinion in many instances between what the public believes schools should be like and what educators believe they should be like. The July 19, 1976, issue of U.S. News and World Report included an article describing a growing public concern over what is taught in the schools. The opposing views are reflected in the opinions of individuals such as the National Education Association's William Hauber. A staff writer for U.S. News and World Report quotes Hauber as saying,

> Selection and presentation of materials falls within the purview of the profession. You don't tell a carpenter which saw or grade of wood to use. If you let inexperienced, unsophisticated, unknowing people make the decisions, teaching quality will be impaired. (U.S. News, p. 38)

August W. Steinhilber, Assistant Executive Director of the National School Board Association, was quoted in this same article as saying his organization believes in lay control of education, not control by the professionals. He said,

> Teachers are entitled to an opinion, to early input, to sit on committees. But the review should be by parents and the community. Who should have greater say than the parents? (U.S. News, p. 38)

A school board member in West Virginia's Kanawha County, Alice Moore, was very critical of the role of government in the rearing of public school children.

She suggested that after government agencies decide what children's standards of morality and political views will be, the only function left to parents will be the provision of food and clothing (p. 39).

Teacher of the year, Myra Lee (1976), noted a need for "basics" in the curriculum, but warned against movements such as "back to basics" that foster elitism. Trends to return to the structure and discipline of a few years ago can lead to oppressed creative thinking that has led one generation to, as Lee says, participate in the destruction of the environment, permit a Watergate to take place, and fail to correctly evaluate our role in Vietnam. Lee would provide parents with a choice of schools. She said

> Parents, students, and teachers who want schools to teach only basics, and use traditional methods should have the opportunity to participate in them. Parents, students, and teachers who want schools to continually expand, and build upon the basics should have a similar opportunity. (p. 65)

When one reviews some of the reasons educators believe schools have failed, one finds a broad spectrum of reasons. Lee speaks of the problem homes, and the anxiety-ridden students it produces. She states that the average American watches television two or three hours per day. The literature reviewed for this research did not examine the relationship between home environment and student achievement, but as Lee implies, a relationship probably does exist and is a valid concern of educators. Franklin (1978) said, "Americans have lost faith in education as a central and critical factor in our lives" (p. 438). He identified three broad categories of problems that are currently plaguing school administrators: negotiations with powerful teacher unions, funding, and race relations. Franklin's concerns seem to focus more on the problems of the school as contrasted with Lee's focus on the problems of the home. The research with which this study was concerned attempted to combine the essence of both positions by measuring attitudes which may be reflective of home environments and achievement which may be reflective of school environments.

Most of the critics, whether professional or lay persons, refer to the same basic problems and offer very similar solutions. Postman (1978) reported on a conference he attended in 1971 which dealt with the problem of education's critics. It was while attending this conference that he became aware of the decline in the education reform movement. He discussed the observations of writers such as John Holt, Ivan Illich, Herbert Kohl, James Herdon and others that advocate a change from rigid policies and procedures that stifle and oppress children. His belief is that the critics are strangely silent now and asked why. Answering his own question, Postman hypothesized that the education reform movement was a spillover from the antiwar movements. When the war ended, so did the protests. He further noted that the complexity of the school as a social institution has become so great that those genuinely interested in its welfare may have failed to grasp its complexity. He believes some critics are utopians seeking total change and they are guilty themselves of harboring contempt for teachers and administrators. Some critics cut themselves off from their constituency--the adults working in the schools. Critics who are actually working in the schools are few and far between. Therefore, another fault Postman noted was that when critics have to make a living being critics, they must actively seek examples of failure, even where the shortcomings are not significant. It also means some of the schools' best critics have to devote most of their efforts to their natural sources of income, leaving the schools uncontaminated with new ideas (p. 21).

Curriculum and Student Achievement

The term "curriculum" may be used by educators and lay persons to mean a number of different things. Walker and Schaffarzick (1974) made reference to the problem of defining this somewhat nebulous term. "Disputes about the proper definition of the term curriculum forms a literature in their own right to which we will not attempt to add" (p. 84).

Armbruster (1977) leveled a scathing attack at the innovative curricula and modern teaching techniques used in many of the public schools today. A factor that does appear to affect the academic achievement of students today is the degree to which educators sacrifice the traditional discipline and teaching techniques that have been effective in the past, for new, untested, "innovative" teaching activities. He traces this trend toward innovation to the 1960's when activist educators began to argue that the traditional curriculum was incapable of teaching the fundamentals to America's poor children. He continued by condemning these "innovators" for opening the schools to values far below the traditional middle class beliefs in correct grammar and meticulous arithmetical operations. He summarized the results of all this innovation by saying,

> They were out to educate the whole child--and alongside such an objective, teaching children to read, write and solve math problems could seem insignificant as well as difficult and dull. (p. 108)

Armbruster suggested that the main fault with the innovative curricula was that it failed to prepare students for the real world. Allowing students to be promoted when they have not achieved is in conflict with the real world of work where people must produce to be promoted. Most work in the real world is "meticulous and correct" every time. Students must be taught the importance of being informed and logical. "To let students believe otherwise is to mislead them dangerously--especially if they are underprivileged" (p. 109).

Interestingly, while Armbruster made his argument that a return to the curriculum and teaching techniques of yesterday was the way to prepare students for the complex world of tomorrow, Boyd (1978) quoted Lazerson's discussion of American critics to the contrary. He noted that the critics argue that American schools have acted to retain the class structure by molding the less favored to the dominant social order (p. 585). He further noted Merelman's (1973) comments about the classical curriculum of the pre-Civil War era with its emphasis on such non-utilitarian courses as Greek and Latin.

> It could not accelerate the burgher into a financial position from which he could threaten his betters, and it was even more useless to the poor man. In short, it contributed markedly to the elevation of church and property over the rest of society. (p. 586)

Armbruster concluded with a warning to parents to pay close attention to the curriculum in their schools and be alert to "specialized" courses of light academic content which have little proven value and are tremendously time consuming (p. 109).

Walker and Schaffarzick (1974) reviewed experiments done since 1957 that attempted to evaluate the subject matter achievement of students using new innovative curricula with the achievement of students who studied from traditional materials. Their findings confirmed results reported earlier:

> Innovative students do better when the criterion is well matched to the innovative curriculum, and traditional students do better when the criterion is matched to the traditional curriculum. (p. 94)

They concluded their review of 26 educational reference works and journals by admitting they looked for signs of superiority of innovative curriculum. What they found was not superiority but parity. Each curriculum did better on the distinctive parts of its own program, and each did about equally well on the parts they held in common (pp. 108-109). Although these findings were disappointing to the researchers, they were reassured that "The application of funded wisdom to the creation and use of curriculum materials is generally producing a pattern of academic achievement consistent with the intentions of curriculum developers" (pp. 108-109).

Others have sought signs of superiority of one curricula over the other. Summers (1979) examined the achievement of students enrolled in the Philadelphia public schools. She found reading achievement related in some ways to the type of curriculum used, but it was more the result of many other characteristics such as amount of direct teacher contact with students, teacher enthusiasm, and amount of student time spent on independent reading (p. 30). Summers concluded that the scarcity and restraints of the era we are presently in call for genuine appraisal of many aspects of the educational process and indicates a need for a combination of general wisdom and modern assessment technology (p. 31). Other literature noted above tends to support Summers' conclusions. Parents of today's school children, the public in general, and school administrators are being pressured to develop a more effective curriculum designed to meet contemporary problems at present or lower levels of expenditure.

Discipline and Student Achievement

Traditionally, discipline has been a characteristic that all schools have held to be tremendously important. No other single characteristic is so visible, even to an untrained lay person, as the good or poor discipline of a school.

Historically, discipline has been defined as the amount of adult control and regimentation found in a classroom. A class where students speak, leave their desks, or talk to peers, only after asking and being granted teacher permission was defined as a well-disciplined classroom or school. The changes in society and schools have resulted in a broader definition of discipline. Newer concepts in school design and more open structuring place emphasis on children controlling themselves instead of being controlled.

Parents have expressed a concern about school discipline for several years. The advent of more liberal open-space schools and forced integration of cultures appears to have contributed significantly to the public's concern about discipline in the schools. Each year since the Gallup Poll has measured the public's attitude toward education (with the exception of 1979), discipline, or the lack of it, has been the greatest concern of the public. Smith and Gallup (1977) believe that the number-one ranking of discipline in seven of eight polls is not as significant an interpretation of the results as is the fact that since 1969, when 26 percent of the respondents cited discipline as one of the biggest problems, as many as one-fourth of the respondents rated it so. Smith and Gallup ask, "Which is the more significant result: that 22 percent of the people rate discipline as a serious problem, or that three-fourths of the people do not rate discipline as a serious concern?" (p. 9).

The Tenth Annual Gallup Poll for 1978 showed a continued concern with discipline. The percentage of those surveyed listing discipline as the biggest problem facing the public schools had increased to 25 percent. Gallup appeared at that time to be giving more credence to those listing discipline as the single largest problem the schools face. Discussing the results of the 1978 survey, he said,

> Since parents with children now attending the public schools presumably are in a better position to judge public school problems than any other groups, their views should carry extra weight. With this group, discipline is ranked first. (p. 34)

Parental concern about the lack of discipline is most likely based on the safety and psychological needs they hold for their children. Educators, while sharing these concerns, are equally interested in student achievement as it relates to discipline. McKinny and others (1975) substantiated the beliefs of many educators with their study of the frequencies of 12 behaviors that predicted achievement scores of 90 second-graders. They found support for the assumption that overt classroom behavior is an important determination of academic progress. They also noted from their analysis that classroom behavior patterns not only contribute to the child's present progress but also predict his progress later in the school year. They considered their more significant finding to be that the variance that was contributed by behavioral data to the prediction of achievement was largely independent of that provided by ability tests. Thus, the addition of behavioral information to test information yielded a more accurate prediction of achievement than could be obtained from either alone (p. 202). These data have implications for the individual child. One would expect that a child who is attentive, independent, and task oriented in his interaction with peers is more likely to succeed academically than the easily distracted, dependent child who is passive in peer group activities (p. 202).

Personnel and Student Achievement

The fact that teachers are required to have some special training indicates the universal acceptance of the notion that teaching is a vocation requiring more than the usual skills needed for mere survival in our society. Whether school personnel are trained in techniques of dealing with human frailties and emotions, methodology of teaching, or the special skills associated with a particular discipline, it is an undisputed point that much special training is required before an individual is equipped to deal with the complex problems constantly present in the average classroom.

Answers to the following often-expressed questions generally lack agreement. What is the minimum amount of training necessary for a teacher to be proficient at his task? Is there a difference between the achievement levels of students taught by teachers with more advanced degrees, compared with those taught by teachers with minimal professional training? The questions appear simple and obvious; that is, does the experience and expertise of school personnel make a difference in the achievement levels attained by students? Summers (1979) found evidence that indicates achievement is affected by teachers, but that the characteristics with which school boards are concerned are not necessarily the ones which have an impact. She found, for example, that the regular presence of the teacher in the classroom is important. Students who had teachers with fewer absences did distinctly better, as did students who had teachers who attended fewer outside conferences. In contrast, those students who had first-year beginning teachers did distinctively worse (p. 23).

These findings are not in conflict with Summers' and Wolfe's (1975a) earlier findings that indicated the amount of education and scores on the National Teachers' Examination do not seem to make more effective educators. Regarding this finding, she said,

> Neither of these factors appear to result in increased productivity. The absence of impact on achievement of extra training is consistent with many educational studies and with the large-scale studies by social scientists--yet teachers who take extra educational work beyond the B.A. are rewarded with salary increases, unlike principals. (p. 15)

A conclusion that seems evident might be that any teacher who meets minimal standards and is enthusiastic, healthy, on the job, and working actively with children could expect some degree of success.

Summers and Wolfe (1975a) found that other characteristics of personnel appear to have little if any impact on student achievement. The characteristics of the school principal which lend themselves to measurement were found not to be clearly related to student achievement (p. 14). It was also noted that the race of the teacher matching the race of the student was unrelated to achievement, and similarly whether a teacher was black or nonblack seemed unrelated to student achievement (p. 14).

Physical Facilities and Student Achievement

One of the largest single expenses most school districts undertake is the construction, equipping, and maintenance of physical facilities. These are necessary expenses that cannot be avoided. School districts have been known to engage in projects ranging from the more palacious buildings with climate-controlled, carpeted, upholstered, interior environments, and architecturally landscaped to the minimal facility that barely meets minimal requirements of safety and comfort. There is much ongoing research which examines the impact of interior designs and organizational patterns on student achievement. These studies, some of which were discussed in the curriculum section, are reviewed because the interior design of school plants dictates the teaching style, organizational patterns, and subsequent achievement of students.

The Edina, Minnesota, School District study by Hoaglund and others (1976) attempted to find identifiable strengths of particular learning environments during a three-year Title IV-C project. Due to the large number of uncontrollable variables, no definitive conclusions could be drawn. The results did suggest, however, that open and team-taught learning environments were more conducive to social interaction, caused less passive learning, and included less large group work. Open-education situations were found to involve students with adults more as they did their work (p. 10).

Glass (1979) examined research which studied the impact of class size on student learning. He examined research dating back to 1900 and covering approximately 900,000 students. Although he found conflicting results, i.e., research before 1940 showed virtually no correlation between class size and achievement, there was much evidence that led to the conclusion that "average pupil achievement increases as class size decreases" (p. 43).

The relationship between class size and achievement has many implications for the study of physical facilities and student achievement. The trend toward open space schools in the last decade has resulted in grouping patterns intended to maximize student-teacher contact time. The effect of this organization has been the reduction of class size for one group of youngsters while increasing class size for another group. Summers and Wolfe (1975a) found evidence which supports the case for smaller schools:

> In smaller schools, increased learning at the elementary and senior levels appears to take place. Black elementary students seem particularly to benefit from being in smaller schools, and low achievers in smaller senior high schools. At the junior high level, school size seems inconsequential over the range examined. (p. 12)

Their study also suggested it is an advantage to be in a school district that has the eighth grade as part of the elementary school system. They found several factors that did not have a significant impact on student achievement. Among these were several physical facility factors. For example, more or less playground space, more or less crowded science labs, age of buildings and general physical condition of the building were named as having little or no impact. Summers and Wolfe (1975a) did qualify some of these findings by saying:

> Some facilities may be far more important in imparting specialized knowledge than they are in imparting the knowledge tested on the general achievement scores reviewed. Furthermore, good facilities may be important in attracting and retaining good teachers. (p. 14)

They also point out that an increased awareness of the energy crisis may reverse trends somewhat and renew interest in the deteriorating neighborhood schools, making them more attractive to better teachers and possibly more energy efficient as well as economical to operate.

Open Education vs. Traditional Education

The wake of the innovative, permissive 1960's left new open-space schools and the question of whether their instructional program is more effective than the traditional self-contained approach. The issue appears to be how much structure the effective curriculum should have. DeTurk (1979) believes teachers and school administrators have placed too much emphasis on order and discipline and not enough on learning. He sees this as a direct response to the public's placing discipline as such a high priority. The problem becomes one of not being able to break the cycle where schools discipline and the public asks for more and more. DeTurk said, "We lack the education, foresight, and leadership to break the cycle" (p. 62). He continued by saying that good schools are structured. The questions are, what kind of structure is best, and whose purpose does it serve?

> Schools with custodial structure, schools with punitive structure, and schools with no structure are good for three things--maintenance, punishment and nothing. They are not very productive in terms of learning--at least, not if we accept learning to be something that is understandable and profitable for students. Let us insist on structure in schools, and let us insist on structures that encourage rather than frustrate our real objective--to develop skill, knowledge, appetite, and discipline. (p. 64)

Not all traditional schools are structured rigidly and not all open-space schools are permissive. Lukasevich and Gray (1978) noted,

> The term open is used indiscriminately in the literature. Some studies of open-space schools assume that instructional practice is open in the schools under study. (p. 108)

Their review of 57 studies of the relationship between openness and pupil outcomes found 19 favored self-contained and 27 reported findings that were not significant. Throughout the literature, the conclusions were, for the most part, similar. No consistent significant differences were found between the instructional programs of the open concept schools and the traditional programs.

McPartland and Epstein's survey (1977) of 6,225 students from nine elementary and secondary schools failed to show a sizeable or consistent positive or negative effect between the openness of a school's instructional program and student achievement. Their work brought them to the conclusion that students neither lose nor gain significantly in their performance on standardized achievement tests as a consequence of attending open schools (p. 144).

Doobs (1974) summarized major studies in the United States and Great Britain which focused on student achievement in open and traditional schools. Her results, while mixed, showed definite strengths in both open and traditional programs for certain types of students. Examining results of Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, she found that each school type met specific needs of certain students better. For example, the results indicated that students from the open schools performed best at the third-grade level while students from conventional schools did better on the test at the fifth-grade level--particularly white male students. They found tests given later, for example in the eighth-grade level, favored the traditional school except in the case of black male students (p. 9).

Research performed for the Pennsylvania Department of Education by Reynolds (1974) examined the achievement of approximately 250 students in grades 1-6 in two elementary schools, one open and one traditional. Reynolds concluded upon analysis of the first year's results that "there was little measurable difference between the two instructional programs" (p. 39).

McCormick, Sheehy, and Mitchell (1978) found evidence that the open environment emphasized individual differences. The study of four different learning environments in the Edina, Minnesota Study by Hoaglund (1976) suggested that studies examining only differences in achievement and attitude of students in open and traditional schools may be missing some of the important differences between the two. Although the authors stress in their summary that "no definite conclusions can be drawn in this paper" (p. 17), they also point out that year-one data suggested there may indeed be some important differences (p. 16).

Brown and Wunderlich (1976) attempted to determine if open education and grouping students according to ability would result in greater student achievement. The difficulty in identifying one organizational technique as being superior was noted in their conclusion that the effect of ability grouping and team-teaching remains inconclusive. They did find that single teacher units result in greater computational skill for students, but may be an indication of more drill and practice activities in this type of setting than in the team setting (p. 7).

The research in this area seems to indicate that questions concerning the effectiveness of curriculum must be answered in terms of specific practices and isolated situations. No trends indicating consistent superiority of a given organizational pattern were noted.

Conclusions

The literature has indicated that overall the public is satisfied with the public schools. There was evidence that they trust the schools and the teachers, and that they are anxious to be more involved in the day-to-day operation of the school.

There was no conclusive evidence which pointed to a particular curriculum as being more beneficial than others.

Discipline was found to be a factor in student learning and was considered by parents to be one of the more urgent problems faced by the schools.

The literature offered little evidence to support theories that suggest the more formal education teachers have, the more success they will have with students. Although the studies were not considered conclusive, they suggested the effective teachers are the ones with positive attitudes that spend more time with their students.

No evidence was offered that indicated physical facilities had much of an impact on student achievement in reading and mathematics. There were implications for specialized subject matter, however.

Finally, no significant conclusive evidence was found that pointed to an "across-the-board" superiority of either open or traditionally organized schools.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Chapter III is devoted to the presentation of the data and the statistical analyses applied to the data.

The data were derived from two primary sources. Achievement scores are composites of the total achievement scores of all of the students examined with the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills in each target school during the 1977-1978 school year. The total number of students taking the examination at each grade level was multiplied by the mean scaled score for that grade level to obtain the gross score for each grade level. The gross scores were totaled and divided by the total number of students taking the examination to get a global achievement score for the school. (See Appendix A for these numbers and calculations.)

Parental attitude scores were obtained from the 1977-1978 Fifth Annual Report of School Progress. These percentage scores refer to the responses of parents to a series of favorable statements on a questionnaire (Appendix C) about each area of the target schools being examined.

Tables 2 and 3 show the global achievement scores for each target school. The lowest achievement score examined was Cleveland in Table 3 and the highest was Morgan Woods in Table 2. As a group, the open schools appear to have scored higher than the traditional schools. The global achievement score for each school does not consider socioeconomic characteristics of the students, or the implications of the much newer facilities of the open schools (previously discussed); therefore, these scores could not be used accurately as the basis for conclusions regarding the value of open or traditional learning environments. The scores are reflective of the achievement of all the students in the given target school for that particular time, for whatever reasons.

Parental Attitude Scores

Parental attitude scores were obtained from the 1977-1978 report of school progress. They are percentage scores which reflect the number of parents that indicated they agree with a series of positive statements regarding each variable being examined. In order to classify the scores as high or low, it was necessary to rank order them from lowest to highest. Those 12 schools ranking from 1 to 12 were classified as low. Schools with rankings from 13 to 24 were classified as high. The high or low rating refers to the placement of the school in the ranking and

Table 2

Global Achievement Scores for Open Schools

School	Score
Bay Crest	343.965
Bellamy	324.872
Chairamonte	328.626
Crestwood	325.763
Kingswood	366.119
Limona	343.728
McDonald	319.617
Morgan Woods	380.106
Mort	325.273
Shaw	338.482
Tinker	371.565
Woodbridge	344.787

$\overline{X}$ = 342.741

Std. dev. = 20.101

Table 3

Global Achievement Scores for Traditional Schools

School	Score
Anderson	312.450
Ballast Point	327.294
Cleveland	276.626
Citrus Park	342.989
Cork	336.863
Dickenson	343.145
Edison	284.965
Gary	315.895
Graham	295.301
Temple Terrace	346.230
Riverview	333.928
Palm River	315.752

$\overline{X} = 317.542$

Std. dev. = 23.526

is determined by the percentage of parents responding favorably to the statements regarding the particular variable being examined.

Table 4 shows the open schools and Table 5 shows the traditional schools, their ranking and percentage of agree responses. The final column has an H if they were ranked high and an L if they were ranked low.

Parental attitude variables were compared to the global achievement score of each target school using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Technique. (Table 6)

The Spearman Rank Order Correlation Technique was selected because it is a nonparametric, or distribution-free, test making use of original data which indicate the relationship between two variables.

A correlation of global achievement scores with parental attitude scores was done in Table 6 in order to establish the relationship between parents' attitude toward the variables and student achievement.

In addition to the correlations with achievement, the variables were examined in comparison to each other to ascertain whether or not any significant relationships existed. Table 7 compares the variable discipline with variables curriculum, personnel and physical facilities.

The variable personnel is compared with curriculum and physical facilities in Table 8, and the variable curriculum is compared to physical facilities in Table 9.

Table 4

Parental Attitude Survey for Students in Open Schools

School	R	Achievement	Rating	R	Curriculum	Rating	R	Discipline	Rating	R	Personnel	Rating	R	Physical Facilities	Rating
Bay Crest	19	343.9	H	18	70.4	H	11	65.3	L	13	73.3	H	18	75.0	H
Bellamy	8	324.8	L	15	69.5	H	23	73.0	H	21	80.4	H	23	86.2	H
Chairamonte	12	328.6	L	7	65.2	L	3	52.7	L	7	68.7	L	11	66.9	L
Crestwood	10	328.6	L	17	70.2	H	17	68.5	H	14	74.2	H	14	70.9	H
Kingswood	22	366.1	H	11	67.6	L	15	67.6	H	4	65.8	L	13	70.4	H
Limona	18	343.7	H	10	66.3	L	18	68.5	H	6	66.0	L	16	73.1	H
McDonald	7	319.6	L	1	59.0	L	5	60.0	L	5	65.7	L	17	75.0	H
Morgan Woods	24	380.1	H	22	77.7	H	4	82.6	H	24	82.9	H	24	89.7	H
Mort	9	325.2	L	12	67.6	L	13	66.9	H	18	77.9	H	22	84.1	H
Shaw	16	338.4	H	9	66.1	L	12	66.7	L	19	78.5	H	21	83.0	H
Tinker	23	371.5	H	21	77.6	H	22	72.6	H	22	80.5	H	15	72.4	H
Woodbridge	20	344.7	H	13	68.1	H	20	68.9	H	16	75.7	H	20	76.8	H

Table 5

Parental Attitude Survey for Students in Traditional Schools

School	R	Achievement	Rating	R	Curriculum	Rating	R	Discipline	Rating	R	Personnel	Rating	R	Physical Facilities	Rating
Anderson	4	312.4	L	5	63.2	L	1	51.8	L	1	58.1	L	2	50.6	L
Ballast Point	11	327.2	L	19	72.1	H	7	62.7	L	17	76.6	H	3	51.4	L
Citrus Park	17	342.9	H	3	60.9	L	10	65.2	L	10	71.0	L	12	69.7	L
Cleveland	1	281.6	L	6	63.5	L	19	68.8	H	11	72.9	L	4	56.3	L
Cork	15	336.8	H	16	69.8	H	14	67.1	H	23	82.3	H	10	65.1	L
Dickenson	13	329.2	H	8	65.7	L	8	64.3	L	8	69.3	L	8	61.3	L
Edison	2	284.9	L	24	80.0	H	9	64.8	L	15	75.3	H	1	49.0	L
Gary	6	315.7	L	20	76.0	H	21	72.5	H	20	80.2	H	5	57.8	L
Graham	3	295.3	L	2	60.5	L	2	51.9	L	3	64.8	L	6	59.3	L
Palm River	14	333.9	H	14	68.7	H	4	56.0	L	9	71.0	L	7	60.2	L
Riverview	5	315.7	L	23	77.7	H	16	67.7	H	2	60.3	L	19	76.1	H
Temple Terrace	21	346.2	L	4	61.6	L	6	61.5	L	12	73.2	L	9	63.3	L

Table 6

Correlation of Global Achievement Scores with Parental Attitude Scores

School	Achievement	Curriculum	Discipline	Personnel	Physical Facilities
Anderson	312.5	63.2	51.8	58.1	50.6
Ballast Point	327.3	72.1	62.7	76.6	51.4
Citrus Park	343.0	60.9	65.2	71.0	69.7
Cleveland	281.7	63.5	68.8	72.9	56.3
Cork	336.9	69.8	67.1	82.3	65.1
Dickenson	329.3	65.7	64.3	69.3	61.3
Edison	285.0	80.0	64.8	75.3	49.0
Gary	315.9	76.0	72.5	80.2	57.8
Graham	295.3	60.5	51.9	64.8	59.3
Palm River	315.8	68.7	56.0	71.0	60.2
Riverview	333.9	77.7	67.7	60.3	76.1
Temple Terrace	346.2	61.6	61.5	73.2	63.3

Table 6 continued

School	Achievement	Curriculum	Discipline	Personnel	Physical Facilities
Bay Crest	344.0	70.0	65.3	73.3	75.0
Bellamy	324.9	69.5	73.0	80.4	86.2
Chairamonte	328.6	65.2	52.7	68.7	66.9
Crestwood	325.8	70.2	68.5	74.2	70.9
Kingswood	366.1	67.6	67.6	65.8	70.4
Limona	343.7	66.3	68.5	66.0	73.1
McDonald	319.6	59.0	60.0	65.7	75.0
Morgan Woods	380.1	77.7	82.6	82.9	89.7
Mort	325.3	67.6	66.9	77.9	84.1
Shaw	338.5	66.1	66.7	78.5	83.0
Tinker	371.6	77.6	72.6	80.5	72.4
Woodbridge	344.8	68.1	68.9	75.7	76.8
Correlation	-	.1157	.2792	.3214	.4566
Significance	-	.295	.093	.063	.012

Note. Standard error of estimates: Curriculum, ± 5.92; Discipline, ± 6.41; Personnel, ± 6.76; Physical Facilities, ± 9.23.

Table 7

Comparison of Parental Attitude Variable Discipline with the Variables Curriculum, Personnel, and Physical Facilities

School	Discipline	Curriculum	Personnel	Physical Facilities
Anderson	51.8	63.2	58.1	50.6
Ballast Point	62.7	72.1	76.6	51.4
Citrus Park	65.2	60.9	71.0	69.7
Cleveland	68.8	63.5	72.9	56.3
Cork	67.1	69.8	82.3	65.1
Dickenson	64.3	65.7	69.3	61.3
Edison	64.8	80.0	75.3	49.0
Gary	72.5	76.0	80.2	57.8
Graham	51.9	60.5	64.8	59.3
Palm River	56.0	68.7	71.0	60.2
Riverview	67.7	77.7	60.3	76.1
Temple Terrace	61.5	61.6	73.2	63.3

Table 7 continued

School	Discipline	Curriculum	Personnel	Physical Facilities
Bay Crest	65.3	70.4	73.3	75.0
Bellamy	73.0	69.5	80.4	86.2
Chairamonte	52.7	65.2	68.7	66.9
Crestwood	68.5	70.2	74.2	70.9
Kingswood	67.6	67.6	65.8	70.4
Limona	68.5	66.3	66.0	73.1
McDonald	60.0	59.0	65.7	75.0
Morgan Woods	82.6	77.7	82.9	89.7
Mort	66.9	67.6	77.9	84.1
Shaw	66.7	66.1	78.5	83.0
Tinker	72.6	77.6	80.5	72.4
Woodbridge	68.9	68.1	75.7	76.8
Correlation	-	.5512	.6064	.5141
Significance	-	.003	.001	.005

Note. Standard error of estimates: Curriculum, ± 4.92; Personnel, ± 5.34; Physical Facilities, ± 9.71.

Table 8

Comparison of the Parental Attitude Variable Personnel with the Variables Curriculum and Physical Facilities

School	Personnel	Curriculum	Physical Facilities
Anderson	58.1	63.2	50.6
Ballast Point	76.6	72.1	51.4
Citrus Park	71.0	60.9	69.7
Cleveland	72.9	63.5	56.3
Cork	82.3	69.8	65.1
Dickenson	69.3	65.7	61.3
Edison	75.3	80.0	49.0
Gary	80.2	76.0	57.8
Graham	64.8	60.5	59.3
Palm River	71.0	68.7	60.2
Riverview	60.3	77.7	76.1
Temple Terrace	73.2	61.6	63.3
Bay Crest	73.3	70.4	75.0
Bellamy	80.4	69.5	86.2
Chairamonte	68.7	65.2	66.9
Crestwood	74.2	70.2	70.9
Kingswood	65.8	67.6	70.4
Limona	66.0	66.3	73.1
McDonald	65.7	59.0	75.0

Table 8 continued

School	Personnel	Curriculum	Physical Facilities
Morgan Woods	82.9	77.7	89.7
Mort	77.9	67.6	84.1
Shaw	78.5	66.1	83.0
Tinker	80.5	77.6	72.4
Woodbridge	75.7	68.1	76.8
Correlation	-	.5586	.2923
Significance	-	.002	.083

Note. Standard error of estimates: Curriculum, ± 5.42; Physical Facilities, ± 11.1.

Table 9

Comparison of the Parental Attitude Variable Curriculum with Variable Physical Facilities

School	Curriculum	Physical Facilities
Anderson	63.2	50.6
Ballast Point	72.1	51.4
Citrus Park	60.9	69.7
Cleveland	63.5	56.3
Cork	69.8	65.1
Dickenson	65.7	61.3
Edison	80.0	49.0
Gary	76.0	57.8
Graham	60.5	60.2
Palm River	68.7	60.2
Riverview	77.7	76.1
Temple Terrace	61.6	63.3
Bay Crest	70.4	75.0
Bellamy	69.5	86.2
Chairamonte	65.2	66.9
Crestwood	70.2	70.9
Kingswood	67.6	70.4
Limona	66.3	73.1
McDonald	59.0	75.0

Table 9 continued

School	Curriculum	Physical Facilities
Morgan Woods	77.7	89.7
Mort	67.6	84.1
Shaw	66.1	83.0
Tinker	77.6	72.4
Woodbridge	68.1	76.8
Correlation	-	.1370
Significance	-	.262

Note. Standard error of estimates: Physical Facilities, ± 11.6.

Finally, the researcher wanted to know if the type of learning environment, open or traditional, had an impact on the parents' attitude. Therefore, each parental attitude variable was examined in relation to each type of school, open and traditional.

The chi-square technique utilizing 2 x 2 contingency tables was chosen to determine if the distribution of schools into the 4 cells was different than what would be expected by chance.

Table 10 has five 2 x 2 contingency tables where the target schools are placed into a cell according to their rank of high or low and whether they are open or traditionally organized.

Summary

The most obvious finding from the parental attitude data (Tables 4 and 5) was the number (11) of traditional schools rated low on the physical facilities variable. Conversely, 11 open schools were rated high and one low, reflecting the parents' concern in this area.

The area of least concern appeared to be curriculum. The ranking for both open and traditional schools was 6 high and 6 low, as would be expected if the parents' responses were not biased.

Table 10

Chi-Square Analysis of the Relationship Between the Parental Attitude Variables, Achievement, and the Type of Learning Environment--Open or Traditional

Achievement vs. School Type

	Open	Traditional
High	8	4
Low	4	8

$\chi^2 = 2.67$

Significance = .102

Curriculum vs. School Type

	Open	Traditional
High	6	6
Low	6	6

$\chi^2 = 0$

Discipline vs. School Type

	Open	Traditional
High	4	8
Low	7	5

$\chi^2 = 1.510$

Significance = .22

Personnel vs. School Type

	Open	Traditional
High	8	4
Low	4	8

$\chi^2 = 2.67$

Significance = .102

Physical Facilities vs. School Type

	Open	Traditional
High	11	1
Low	1	11

$\chi^2 = 16.666$

Significance = .00004

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of this research was to determine what relationships existed, if any, between parents' attitude toward the school's curriculum, discipline, personnel, and physical facilities and student achievement in reading and mathematics. The study was further designed to examine those relationships in open and traditionally organized learning situations.

The limitations of the data make definite conclusions impossible; however, some trends were noted and possible causes and implications are discussed.

The Relationship Between Parental Attitude Toward Type of School and Student Achievement

The relationship between school type and student achievement was examined by the use of the chi-square technique. A 2 x 2 contingency table was used to determine the distribution of schools into the four respective categories. Of the 24 target schools, eight open and four traditional were in the top half of the rankings in student achievement and were classified as high achievers. The other half of the sample had four open and eight traditional schools and these 12 schools were classified as low achievers. The level of statistical significance was established at $p > .05$, and this classification was found to be not significant. This finding suggested that student achievement in reading and mathematics was not significantly different in either type of school, open or traditional. These findings are consistent with those of Doobs (1974), who found each type of school to have its own particular strengths. McPartland and Epstein's (1977) findings were also substantiated, in that no sizeable or consistent positive or negative effect was noted as related to the type of school.

The examination of the relationship between parental attitude toward curriculum and school type produced a 2 x 2 contingency table with an even distribution of six schools in each cell. The chi-square for this distribution was zero, since no deviation from what would be expected by chance was noted. These findings suggest that parental attitude toward curriculum was about the same for both types of schools.

Parental attitude toward discipline did not vary significantly with the type of school. The distribution of schools into cells to test this relationship resulted in four open and eight traditional schools classified as high and seven open and five traditional schools classified as low. The chi-square for this distribution was 1.510. Here $p > .05$ and was not considered significant.

The distribution of schools in the table examining parent attitude toward personnel and school type resulted in eight open and four traditional schools classified as high and four open and eight traditional schools classified as low. The chi-square statistic for this distribution was 2.67 where $p > .05$ and, therefore, not held to be significant.

The distribution of schools into the contingency table illustrating the relationship between parental attitude toward facilities and school type resulted in 11 open and one traditional school classified as high and one open and 11 traditional schools classified as low. The chi-square for this relationship was 6.666 where $p < .05$ and was classified as significant.

The data suggest that parents whose children attend public schools do not feel differently about the curriculum, discipline, and personnel in either type of school.

The significant relationship between parents' attitude toward physical facilities and school type may be a reflection of their personal preferences for open or traditional facilities. The fact that the newest schools in Hillsborough County are open in design, better equipped, and have more creature comforts may tend to promote a higher degree of parental satisfaction with this type of facility.

The Relationship Between the Parental Attitude Variables of Curriculum, Discipline, Personnel, Physical Facilities and Student Achievement

The relationship between the parental attitude variables and student achievement was examined by the use of the Spearman rank order correlation technique.

Parental attitude toward the school's curriculum was positively correlated with student achievement ($r = .1157$ and $p > .05$), but was not a significant relationship at the .05 level of confidence.

This finding suggests that parents' feelings toward what is taught and how it is taught have little impact on how well they perceive their children master the subject. Therefore, parental approval or disapproval of the curriculum would not be expected to have an impact on student achievement.

Similarly, the relationships between the parents' attitudes toward discipline and achievement and personnel and achievement were found not to be significant. The relationship was positively correlated ($r = .2792$ and $p > .05$) in the first case and $r = .3214$ and $p > .05$ in the second case.

These findings were surprising and did not support the literature in which McKinny and others (1975) indicate that discipline has a major impact on student achievement. Since this study examined parental attitude toward discipline instead of discipline *per se*, McKinny's work is not refuted. However, these results do not contribute support to his findings either.

Parental attitude toward school personnel was not found to have a significant relationship to student achievement or the lack of it. These findings imply that a well-loved teacher should not be related to greater success with students, and a less popular teacher should not be related to less successful results.

The significant finding in the relationship between school type and parental attitude toward physical facilities previously reported was substantiated by the positive correlation ($r = .4566$ and $p < .05$) between parental attitude toward physical facilities and student achievement.
With the exception of the parental attitude toward physical facilities no significant relationship was noted between parental attitude toward curriculum, discipline, personnel, and student achievement. These findings are consistent with the literature in part and fail to support other findings in part. Reynolds' finding of little measurable difference in the achievement of students taught in open and traditional learning environments was supported. Yet, this research neither refutes nor substantiates previous examinations of curriculum and achievement. The finding of no significant relationship between parental attitude toward curriculum and student achievement is compatible with Summers' findings that achievement was more the result of characteristics other than curriculum.

Gallup's polls for the years 1969-1976 listed curriculum as a significant parental concern only in 1976, and then it was fourth behind discipline, integration and finance.

The finding of no significant relationship between parental attitude toward discipline and student achievement was not consistent with the findings of earlier studies. Gallup has consistently found discipline to be a major concern parents have with the schools. McKinny's finding that overt behavior is an important determinant of academic progress indicates some research supports the issue of parental concerns about discipline; however, this concern does not appear to have significant implications for student achievement.

The significant finding between parental attitude toward physical facilities and student achievement was not consistent with Summers' finding of no relationship between facilities and student achievement. Hillsborough County data possibly reflect the location of newer schools in suburban areas where more middle and upper socioeconomic families are located. These parents may contribute more to their children's education than do lower socioeconomic parents living in older neighborhoods with older schools. Parents may have strong feelings either favorable or unfavorable toward schools that have very good or very poor facilities. These strong feelings may be reflected in student achievement scores as parental help and encouragement at home changes with the physical plant to which their children are assigned.

The Relationship Between Parental Attitude Variables Curriculum, Discipline, Personnel and Physical Facilities

The relationship between parental attitude toward curriculum and parental attitude toward discipline was determined by the use of the Spearman rank order correlation technique. In this positive correlation ($r = .5512$ and $p < .05$), the relationship was considered significant at the .05 level of confidence. This relationship appears to suggest a consistency in parental attitudes and implies that when parents have either exceptionally strong or weak feelings about the school's curriculum, they could be expected to hold similar beliefs about the school's discipline and vice versa.

The examination of the relationship between parental attitude toward curriculum and parental attitude toward school personnel was found to have a positive correlation ($r = .5586$ and $p < .05$). Therefore, this relationship was also found to be significant. It may be that parental attitude toward various aspects of the school program tend to be uniform and consistent. Dissatisfaction with curriculum indicates similar dissatisfaction with discipline and personnel and vice versa.

Parents do appear to separate those aspects of education related to the learning process from those related to comfort. The relationship of attitude toward curriculum and attitude toward physical facilities was positive ($r = .1370$). The significance level was $p > .05$ and therefore considered not significant.

The relationship between discipline and physical facilities was positively correlated ($r = .5141$ and $p < .05$). Therefore, this relationship was considered significant. Such a relationship suggests that parents having strong positive or negative feelings about the physical facilities have some of the same feelings about the discipline of the school.

The correlation between parents' attitude toward discipline and their attitude toward personnel was positively correlated ($r = .6064$ and $p < .05$); therefore, it was classified as significant. These findings suggest that parents who view a school as being adequately disciplined or poorly disciplined simultaneously view the personnel of the school as being adequate or inadequate. McKinny's (1975) research ties discipline directly to student achievement. His findings probably substantiate a basic feeling of most parents and educators that undisciplined, uncontrolled students probably are not achieving at the same level as the quiet, organized, well-disciplined students.

Parents' attitude toward discipline and their attitude toward physical facilities was positively correlated

($r = .5141$ and $p < .05$) and was, therefore, considered significant.

The particular bias of the Hillsborough County sample, where newer schools cater to a younger, more highly ranked socioeconomic population, could be expected to have an impact on parental attitudes toward both discipline and physical facilities.

The relationship between parents' attitude toward school personnel and their attitude toward physical facilities was positively correlated ($r = .2923$ and $p > .05$) but was not a significant relationship at the .05 level of confidence.

Conclusions

Question one asked, "What is the parents' attitude toward school curriculum, discipline, personnel, and physical facilities in the target elementary schools?" These attitudes were reflected in the results obtained from the questionnaire utilized in gathering information for the Fifth Annual Report of School Progress, and are summarized in Tables 4 and 5.

Of the 24 target schools in the study, parents responded favorably to the statements toward curriculum an average of 68.5 percent of the time. The highest amount of favorable responses was 80.0 percent, and the lowest was 59.0 percent. The distribution of schools shows that 11 were above the mean and 13 were below the mean.

Parents' attitude toward discipline averaged 65.3 percent favorable responses, with a high of 82.6 and a low of 51.8. The distribution of schools shows that 13 were above the mean and 10 were below the mean, with one the same as the mean.

Parents' attitude toward personnel averaged 72.6 percent favorable responses with a high of 82.9 percent and a low of 58.1 percent. The distribution of schools shows that 15 were above the mean and 9 were below the mean.

Parents' attitude toward physical facilities averaged 68.4 percent favorable responses, with a high of 89.7 percent and a low of 49.0 percent. The distribution shows that 13 schools were above the mean and 11 were below the mean.

Question two asked, "What is the achievement in reading and mathematics of the students in the target schools?" Tables 2 and 3 list the global achievement scores for the target schools. The 12 open schools had a mean achievement score of 342.741, with a high score of 380.109 and a low score of 319.617. They were evenly distributed with six schools above the mean and six below the mean.

The 12 traditional schools had a mean achievement score of 317.545 with a high score of 346.230 and a low score of 276.626.

Question three asked, "What is the statistical relationship between parental attitude toward the school curriculum, discipline, personnel, physical facilities, and student achievement in the target schools?" Table 6 shows that each of these variables is positively correlated with achievement. Curriculum, r = .1157, s = .295; discipline, r = .2792, s = .093; personnel, r = .3214, s = .063; and physical facilities, r = .4566, s = .012.

Question four asked, "Is the relationship between parental attitude toward curriculum, discipline, personnel, and physical facilities greater in open or traditionally organized schools?" Table 10 shows no statistically significant difference in school type and achievement, curriculum, discipline, and personnel. A statistically significant difference in attitude was noted between physical facilities and school type.

The limitations of the study and the restricted sample size reduce the ability to generalize accurately to other populations. Readers should be mindful of these limitations when studying these findings.

This study found six of the 15 relationships tested to be significant and nine to be nonsignificant statistically.

The type of school, open or traditional, did not appear to be of concern to parents where measures of achievement, curriculum, discipline, and personnel were evaluated.

Parental attitude toward physical facilities appeared to be related to the type of school. Parents whose children attended "open" schools rated those facilities high and parents whose children attended "traditional" schools rated those facilities low. These findings may be partially explained by the fact that the "open" schools are located in developing residential neighborhoods and of more recent construction; while the traditional schools are found in older, more established neighborhoods and lack some of the amenities (e.g., carpeting) of the newer schools.

A significant relationship was also noted between their attitude toward physical facilities and discipline and physical facilities and achievement.

The relationship between physical facilities and curriculum was not significant.

Parental attitude toward curriculum, discipline and personnel did not appear significantly related to student achievement.

A significant relationship was noted between the parents' attitude toward curriculum and their attitude toward discipline. Also, a significant relationship was noted between their attitude toward curriculum and their attitude toward personnel.

The relationship between the parents' attitude toward curriculum and their attitude toward physical facilities was not found to be significant.

Parental attitude toward discipline and their attitude toward personnel were found to be significant. Implications are that when parents have favorable feelings about the school's discipline, they have favorable feelings about the school's personnel, and vice versa.

The relationship between parental attitude toward personnel and their attitude toward physical facilities was not significant and this suggests that parents do not hold personnel responsible for the physical facilities in which their children attend school.

These findings suggest school personnel should be mindful that parental attitude toward curriculum is related to their attitude toward discipline. They should also be aware that a similar attitude is held toward personnel and curriculum. If good school/community relations are the sought-after goals, school personnel must maintain positive parental attitudes toward the school's curriculum, discipline, personnel, and physical facilities, since they are all significantly interrelated.

The significant relationship between parental attitude toward physical facilities and student achievement support decisions by school administrators to appropriate funds for improvement of physical facilities.

This research and the related literature suggest that when making decisions concerning the type of school to be constructed, school officials should concern themselves more with what the public attitude is toward the type of building, the cost of maintenance and construction, etc., since no consistent superiority of one type facility over the other was found.

Recommendations

This study found a significant relationship between parental attitude toward physical facilities and student achievement as well as school type and physical facilities.

Although several other relationships were found significant, these two findings suggest that feelings of adequacy toward the physical facilities have a positive relationship with student achievement.

Studies appear to be needed that could generalize these findings to all school systems. If future studies substantiate these findings, it would seem to be worthwhile for school personnel to strive for favorable parental attitude toward school facilities through new construction and cleaning and maintenance of older facilities.

Further research that examines interschool differences is needed to test parental attitude by grade level within each school.

School administrators seeking to build more harmonious relations with their communities must be aware that a significant relationship has been found between parents' attitude toward school discipline, curriculum, and personnel.

Also, a significant relationship exists between the parents' attitude toward the physical facilities and their attitude toward the school discipline.

Programs to improve school/community relations should therefore be total programs with multifaceted programs of improvement.

School officials should be alert to criticisms of singular aspects of the school such as the curriculum or discipline since a poor level of acceptance in one area may spawn similar dissatisfaction with other areas.

APPENDIX A

GLOBAL ACHIEVEMENT SCORES FOR OPEN AND TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

Table A-1

Global Achievement Scores for Open Schools

School	Grade	Number	Scaled Score	Product	Achievement Score
Bay Crest	1	149	216.1	32198.9	
	2	129	315.1	40647.9	
	3	108	361.8	39074.4	
	4	110	410.3	45133.0	
	5	123	454.1	55854.3	
		619		212909.0	343.956
Bellamy	1	201	214.9	43194.9	
	2	171	290.7	49709.7	
	3	162	350.0	56700.0	
	4	130	409.6	53248.0	
	5	113	438.7	49573.1	
		777		252426.0	324.872
Chairamonte	1	129	214.2	27631.8	
	2	107	288.1	30826.7	
	3	104	355.2	36940.8	
	4	93	381.0	35433.0	
	5	117	426.6	49912.2	
		550		180745.0	328.626

Table A-1 continued

School	Grade	Number	Scaled Score	Product	Achievement Score
Crestwood	1	141	216.7	30554.7	
	2	129	287.5	37087.5	
	3	132	339.5	44814.0	
	4	120	381.4	45768.0	
	5	113	430.4	48635.2	
		635		206859.0	325.763
Kingswood	1	187	231.7	43327.9	
	2	183	320.1	58578.3	
	3	190	389.2	73948.0	
	4	214	424.3	90800.2	
	5	184	457.0	84088.0	
		958		350742.0	366.119
Limona	1	174	212.7	37009.8	
	2	193	299.8	57861.4	
	3	150	373.0	55950.0	
	4	164	404.4	66321.6	
	5	154	453.7	69869.8	
		835		287013.0	343.728
McDonald	1	138	221.7	30594.6	
	2	128	280.6	35916.8	
	3	110	324.6	35706.0	
	4	115	382.1	43941.5	
	5	125	405.8	50725.0	
		616		196884.0	319.617

Table A-1 continued

School	Grade	Number	Scaled Score	Product	Achievement Score
Morgan Woods	1	153	246.9	37775.7	
	2	177	333.8	59082.6	
	3	148	413.0	61124.0	
	4	146	435.8	63626.8	
	5	146	486.8	71072.8	
		770		292682.0	380.106
Mort	1	189	212.7	40200.3	
	2	182	278.7	50723.4	
	3	137	356.4	48826.8	
	4	122	406.9	49641.8	
	5	139	437.0	60743.0	
		769		250135.0	325.273
Shaw	1	167	219.4	36639.8	
	2	126	299.3	37711.8	
	3	145	373.7	54186.5	
	4	124	405.6	50294.4	
	5	105	447.0	46935.0	
		667		225768.0	338.482
Tinker	1	139	263.5	36626.5	
	2	119	337.4	40150.6	
	3	94	416.6	39160.4	
	4	84	438.4	36825.6	
	5	86	479.0	41194.0	
		522		193957.0	371.565

Table A-1 continued

School	Grade	Number	Scaled Score	Product	Achievement Score
Woodbridge	1	202	224.9	45429.8	
	2	195	314.1	61249.5	
	3	160	357.3	57168.0	
	4	128	443.1	56716.8	
	5	136	459.6	62505.6	
		821		283070.0	344.787

Table A-2

Global Achievement Scores for Traditional Schools

School	Grade	Number	Scaled Score	Product	Achievement Score
Anderson	1	122	212.0	25864.0	
	2	91	285.9	26016.9	
	3	91	272.7	24815.7	
	4	86	404.1	34752.6	
	5	75	451.2	33840.0	
		465		145289.2	312.450
Ballast Point	1	149	210.8	31409.2	
	2	137	302.1	41387.7	
	3	121	356.5	43136.5	
	4	115	380.8	43792.0	
	5	112	426.6	47779.2	
		634		207505.6	327.294
Cleveland	1	95	166.1	15779.5	
	2	63	259.6	16354.8	
	3	49	344.4	16875.6	
	4	48	347.9	16699.2	
	5	59	358.5	21151.5	
		314		86860.6	276.626

Table A-2 continued

School	Grade	Number	Scaled Score	Product	Achievement Score
Citrus Park	1	179	209.7	37536.3	
	2	160	301.8	48288.0	
	3	151	399.2	60279.2	
	4	127	410.2	52095.4	
	5	127	448.7	56984.9	
		744		255184.0	342.989
Cork	1	163	221.7	36137.1	
	2	150	305.0	45750.0	
	3	119	354.8	42221.2	
	4	122	399.0	48678.0	
	5	142	434.3	61670.6	
		696		234457.0	336.863
Dickenson	1	127	221.7	28155.9	
	2	150	305.0	45750.0	
	3	119	354.8	42221.2	
	4	122	399.0	48678.0	
	5	142	434.3	61670.6	
		660		226476.0	343.145
Edison	1	109	180.2	19641.8	
	2	91	253.1	23032.1	
	3	77	321.6	24763.2	
	4	42	364.1	15292.2	
	5	72	398.5	28692.0	
		391		111421.0	284.965

Table A-2 continued

School	Grade	Number	Scaled Score	Product	Achievement Score
Gary	1	28	146.1	4090.8	
	2	37	383.2	14178.4	
	3	39	319.6	12464.4	
	4	20	332.1	6642.0	
	5	24	390.7	9376.8	
		148		46752.4	315.895
Graham	1	107	188.5	20169.5	
	2	82	265.5	21779.2	
	3	66	355.2	23443.2	
	4	53	371.9	19710.7	
	5	52	407.8	21205.6	
		360		106308.0	295.301
Palm River	1	178	221.4	39409.2	
	2	134	305.9	40990.6	
	3	147	323.2	47510.4	
	4	119	383.9	45684.1	
	5	109	397.5	43327.5	
		687		216922.0	315.752
Riverview	1	139	220.2	30607.8	
	2	127	284.9	36182.3	
	3	109	347.1	37833.9	
	4	117	401.6	46987.2	
	5	115	444.2	51083.0	
		607		202694.0	333.928

Table A-2 continued

School	Grade	Number	Scaled Score	Product	Achievement Score
Temple Terrace	1	176	236.7	41659.2	
	2	167	300.0	50100.0	
	3	172	377.7	64964.4	
	4	148	390.0	57720.0	
	5	147	449.0	66003.0	
		810		280447.0	346.230

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Table B-1

Responses to Questionnaire - Open Schools

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Bay Crest						
Curriculum Average	70.4	7.2	6.3	15.1	.9	53
Personnel Average	73.3	6.6	8.2	10.7	1.3	52
Discipline Average	65.3	5.7	15.5	12.5	1.1	52
Physical Facilities Average	75.0	3.4	3.4	12.0	6.3	49
Bellamy						
Curriculum Average	69.9	5.1	3.0	18.0	2.7	67
Personnel Average	80.4	4.8	5.6	6.0	1.0	68
Discipline Average	73.0	6.4	12.8	7.6	.0	69
Physical Facilities Average	86.2	1.1	2.2	8.6	1.9	66

Table B-1 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Chiaramonte						
Curriculum Average	65.2	3.0	5.6	25.8	.5	33
Personnel Average	68.7	6.1	9.1	16.2	.0	33
Discipline Average	52.7	7.9	21.2	18.2	.0	33
Physical Facilities Average	66.9	5.9	9.6	16.9	.7	34
Crestwood						
Curriculum Average	70.2	4.5	5.6	17.8	3.6	32
Personnel Average	74.2	6.6	5.6	9.6	2.0	32
Discipline Average	68.5	6.7	15.6	9.7	2.4	32
Physical Facilities Average	78.9	.6	10.2	5.8	4.7	31

Table B-1 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Kingswood						
Curriculum Average	67.0	5.3	6.0	19.4	2.2	90
Personnel Average	60.0	3.1	12.0	16.0	1.1	91
Discipline Average	67.6	4.6	16.7	14.6	1.5	91
Physical Facilities Average	70.4	8.7	6.2	16.6	2.2	90
Limona						
Curriculum Average	66.3	5.2	5.8	21.7	1.0	79
Personnel Average	66.0	7.1	12.3	14.0	.6	60
Discipline Average	68.5	3.6	13.3	12.0	1.8	79
Physical Facilities Average	73.1	3.8	6.3	16.3	2.5	78

Table B-1 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
McDonald						
Curriculum Average	59.0	7.1	5.2	27.2	1.5	53
Personnel Average	65.7	6.5	11.1	13.3	3.4	52
Discipline Average	60.0	7.8	10.1	13.3	.7	54
Physical Facilities Average	75.0	3.6	5.7	12.7	2.5	52
Morgan Woods						
Curriculum Average	77.7	2.3	5.0	13.6	1.2	85
Personnel Average	82.9	4.1	4.7	8.1	.2	86
Discipline Average	82.6	2.6	8.1	5.6	.9	85
Physical Facilities Average	69.7	1.4	1.4	6.6	.9	86

Table B-1 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Mort						
Curriculum Average	67.6	7.6	9.4	12.7	2.7	54
Personnel Average	77.9	7.0	9.1	4.8	1.2	54
Discipline Average	66.9	6.2	16.4	10.2	.4	55
Physical Facilities Average	84.1	3.2	5.9	4.5	2.3	54
Shaw						
Curriculum Average	66.1	3.0	9.1	19.4	2.4	54
Personnel Average	76.5	4.8	7.9	7.2	1.5	54
Discipline Average	66.7	2.9	18.9	7.6	1.8	54
Physical Facilities Average	83.0	2.2	3.6	8.0	3.1	54

Table B-1 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Tinker						
Curriculum Average	77.6	6.6	4.3	9.8	1.7	57
Personnel Average	80.5	3.7	8.9	5.7	1.1	57
Discipline Average	72.6	2.8	17.6	3.1	3.8	56
Physical Facilities Average	72.4	5.6	6.5	9.9	5.6	55
Woodbridge						
Curriculum Average	68.1	5.3	5.5	17.1	4.0	76
Personnel Average	75.7	5.3	7.2	9.1	2.7	77
Discipline Average	68.9	4.8	18.2	5.8	2.3	77
Physical Facilities Average	76.8	4.7	3.8	8.9	3.8	76

Table B-2

Responses to Questionnaire - Traditional Schools

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Anderson						
Curriculum Average	63.2	3.6	9.0	23.1	.9	39
Personnel Average	58.1	6.4	19.2	16.2	.0	39
Discipline Average	51.8	9.7	26.7	11.3	.5	39
Physical Facilities Average	50.6	9.6	8.3	22.4	9.0	36
Ballast Point						
Curriculum Average	72.1	3.5	5.8	17.0	1.6	51
Personnel Average	76.6	4.5	5.8	12.6	.6	52
Discipline Average	62.7	6.5	15.8	13.6	1.5	51
Physical Facilities Average	51.4	5.8	11.5	26.4	4.8	50

Table B-2 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Citrus Park						
Curriculum Average	60.9	6.6	5.6	25.3	1.8	65
Personnel Average	71.0	4.0	7.1	16.9	1.0	65
Discipline Average	65.2	3.3	17.6	13.0	.9	65
Physical Facilities Average	69.7	6.1	6.8	15.2	2.3	65
Cleveland						
Curriculum Average	63.5	5.2	14.6	12.5	4.2	15
Personnel Average	72.9	4.2	9.4	12.5	1.0	16
Discipline Average	68.8	3.8	10.0	15.0	2.5	16
Physical Facilities Average	56.3	4.7	9.4	20.3	9.4	15

Table B-2 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Cork						
Curriculum Average	69.8	7.3	8.0	13.5	1.4	47
Personnel Average	82.3	6.6	3.8	4.6	.7	45
Discipline Average	67.1	7.1	14.2	9.6	2.1	47
Physical Facilities Average	65.1	6.8	9.4	17.2	1.6	47
Dickenson						
Curriculum Average	65.7	3.6	4.2	24.8	1.6	50
Personnel Average	69.3	8.2	8.6	12.7	1.0	51
Discipline Average	64.3	7.5	16.9	10.6	.8	51
Physical Facilities Average	61.3	7.4	6.4	22.5	2.5	50

Table B-2 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Edison						
Curriculum Average	80.0	.7	6.0	11.3	2.0	25
Personnel Average	75.3	.7	14.0	8.6	2.0	25
Discipline Average	64.8	2.4	18.4	12.8	1.6	25
Physical Facilities Average	49.0	5.8	18.3	10.6	16.3	22
Gary						
Curriculum Average	76.0	3.1	6.3	13.5	1.0	16
Personnel Average	80.2	4.2	6.3	8.3	1.0	16
Discipline Average	72.5	3.8	13.6	2.6	1.3	16
Physical Facilities Average	57.8	6.3	7.8	26.6	1.6	16

Table B-2 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Graham						
Curriculum Average	60.5	6.8	6.2	28.3	1.2	27
Personnel Average	64.0	6.2	8.6	20.4	.0	27
Discipline Average	51.9	6.7	8.9	26.9	3.7	26
Physical Facilities Average	59.3	2.0	5.6	26.9	5.6	26
Riverview						
Curriculum Average	77.7	3.0	4.5	11.0	3.8	42
Personnel Average	60.3	3.0	9.5	4.2	3.0	43
Discipline Average	67.7	5.9	15.9	6.4	4.1	42
Physical Facilities Average	76.1	5.1	7.4	4.3	5.1	42

Table B-2 continued

Variables	Agree	No Opinion	Don't Know	Disagree	Invalid/ Blank	Total Responses
Palm River						
Curriculum Average	68.7	6.0	6.7	15.0	3.7	48
Personnel Average	71.0	10.0	10.3	7.3	1.3	49
Discipline Average	56.0	10.8	15.2	15.6	2.4	49
Physical Facilities Average	60.2	7.7	7.7	21.9	2.6	48
Temple Terrace						
Curriculum Average	61.6	5.3	8.7	21.3	2.8	80
Personnel Average	73.2	4.3	8.7	12.6	1.2	81
Discipline Average	61.5	8.0	15.9	12.4	2.2	80
Physical Facilities Average	63.3	8.6	6.8	17.4	3.7	78

APPENDIX C

PARENT OPINION SURVEY

PARENT OPINION SURVEY

Dear Parent: Since you and your children are the "customers" of our school, we would like to know how we can do a better job for you. Please check your feeling about each of the statements. Use the enclosed window envelope with the name and address showing in the window to return the sheet by MAY 2. Your school's name has been identified in parenthesis. No postage is necessary. DO NOT sign your name or identify yourself in any way.

Your opinion is essential as the information will be summarized and distributed to all parents. In addition, school and county-wide summaries will be presented to the School Board and may be used as information for district-wide planning.

INSTRUCTIONS: Put a check mark by each question under the heading you feel is closest to your own feelings.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
CURRICULUM					
1. The number of students in your child's classes is satisfactory for learning.	___	___	___	___	___
2. Assigned work is equal to your child's ability.	___	___	___	___	___
3. Your child's school books are current (no more than five years old).	___	___	___	___	___

Appendix C continued

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. Your child has the necessary books for each subject.	____	____	____	____	____
5. The school provides enough extracurricular activities (e.g., clubs, plays, concerts, athletics, etc.).	____	____	____	____	____
6. The school is adequately preparing your child for future education or training.	____	____	____	____	____
7. Homework is sufficient to aid classroom work.	____	____	____	____	____
8. School subjects are preparing your child to be an informed citizen.	____	____	____	____	____
9. You understand the results of your child's standardized achievement test as reported to you.	____	____	____	____	____
10. Teachers use standardized achievement test results to give individual attention to your child.	____	____	____	____	____
11. The report card tells you what you need to know about your child's progress.	____	____	____	____	____
12. The school keeps you well informed of your child's performance between report card periods.	____	____	____	____	____

Appendix C continued

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
PERSONNEL					
13. The principal is doing a good job.	____	____	____	____	____
14. Teachers give your child individual help as needed.	____	____	____	____	____
15. Teachers treat your child fairly.	____	____	____	____	____
16. School officials treat your child fairly.	____	____	____	____	____
17. Teachers are doing a satisfactory job in educating your child.	____	____	____	____	____
18. Your visits to the school are welcomed by the principal.	____	____	____	____	____
19. Teachers welcome your visits to the school.	____	____	____	____	____
20. There is someone at the school with whom you can discuss your child's problems.	____	____	____	____	____
21. Problems discussed with personnel are given reasonable attention.	____	____	____	____	____
DISCIPLINE					
22. Student conduct at school is satisfactory.	____	____	____	____	____

Appendix C continued

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
23. Teachers maintain good order in your child's classes.	____	____	____	____	____
24. Rules at the school are applied fairly.	____	____	____	____	____
25. You understand the school suspension system.	____	____	____	____	____
26. Your child is safe from harassment by outside intruders at school.	____	____	____	____	____
27. Other students treat your child well.	____	____	____	____	____
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES					
28. Your child has the opportunity to see a guidance counselor as needed.	____	____	____	____	____
29. Your child can work with a specialist (e.g., reading, speech, etc.) as needed.	____	____	____	____	____
30. The school provides sufficient job information to help in choosing a future career.	____	____	____	____	____
PHYSICAL FACILITIES					
31. The school building is in good repair.	____	____	____	____	____

Appendix C continued

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
32. The school building is clean.	____	____	____	____	____
33. Your child's classroom is well equipped.	____	____	____	____	____
34. Your child's classroom is comfortable.	____	____	____	____	____

GENERAL

	Yes	No
35. Did you read last year's Annual Report of School Progress?	____	____

OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS:

REFERENCES

Armbruster, F.E. Why American education is failing. Reader's Digest, January 1977, pp. 106-109.

Bard, B. Why our schools are failing. Parents' Magazine, September 1976, pp. 40-41.

Barth, R.S. Parents as helpers, critics, and adversaries. National Elementary Principal, 1978, 58, 52-60.

Berry, M.F. The concept of excellence. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 60, 196S-197S.

Boyd, W.L. The changing politics of curriculum policy making for American schools. Review of Educational Research, 1978, 48, 577-628.

Brown, S.W. & Wunderlich, K.W. The effect of open concept education and ability grouping on achievement level concerning the teaching of fifth grade mathematics. San Antonio, Texas: The University of Texas, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED128197.)

Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Level 1, Form S, Extended Edition, 1974, p. 1.

Davies, D. Citizen Participation in schools. The Educational Digest, 1978, 43(8), 2-5.

DeTurk, P.H. Structuring joy and enjoying structure. National Elementary Principal, 1979, 58, 60-64.

Doobs, H.S. Summary of research on open education. Educational Research Service Brief, 1974, 47.

Farmer, F. Have schools kept faith with the public? Speech, February 16, 1979, published by Public Information Office, Hillsborough County, Florida, Schools.

Fifth Annual Report of School Progress, Hillsborough County Public Schools, 1977-78.

Floyd, M.J. Schools and parental satisfaction. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 356.

Franklin, J.H. Americans have lost faith in education. Intellect, May 1978, 438.

Gallup, G.H. The ninth annual poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1962, 1962, 59, 34-37.

Glass, G.V. Class size and learning--new interpretation of the research literature. Today's Education, April-May 1979, 42-45.

Hechinger, F.M. Schoolyard blues: The decline of public education. Saturday Review, January 1979, 20-22.

Hoaglund, M. The ecology of learning: A comparison of alternative elementary school learning environments. San Francisco, California, American Education Research Association, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126591.)

Kilpatrick, J.J. How our schools can do a better job. Nation's Business, May 1978, 13-14.

Lee, M. Society and the failure of schools. Today's Education, November-December 1976, 64-65.

Lukasevich, A. & Gray, R.F. Open space, open education and pupil performance. The Elementary School Journal, 1978, 79(2), 108-114.

McCormick, M., Sheehy, N., & Mitchell, J. Traditional vs. open classroom structure and examiner style: The effect on creativity in children. Child Study Journal, 1978, 8(2), 75-82.

McKinny, J., Mason, J., Perkinson, K. & Clifford, M. Relationship between classroom behavior and academic achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67(2), 198-203.

McPartland, J.M. & Epstein, J.L. Open schools and achievement: Tests of a finding of no relationship. Sociology of Education, 1977, 42, 133-144.

Minarcini v. Strongsville City School District, 541 F.2d 577 (6th Cir. 1976).

Pico v. Board of Education, Island Trees Union Free School District, 474 F. Supp. 387 (E.D.N.Y. 1979).

Postman, N. Where have all the critics gone? The Educational Digest, 1978, 43, 19-22.

President's Council, Dist. 25 v. Community School Board No. 25, 457 F.2d 289 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 409 U.S. 998 (1972).

Reynolds, R.N. A comparative study of the effects of an open classroom instructional program and a traditional instructional program. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: State Department of Education, Bureau of Information, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED093907.)

Robb, G.P. & Turney, B.Y. Statistical methods for behavioral science. New York: Intex Educational Publishers, 1973.

Roper, D. Critical examination of factors related to school failure. Education, March-April 1978, 322-324.

Sabol, J. Somebody out there must be doing something right. English Journal, 1976, 65, 7.

Sanoff, A.P. Why teachers are under fire. The Education Digest, 1978, 43(7), 2-4.

Sealey, L. Open education, a study of selected American elementary schools. New Haven, Connecticut: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED151076.)

Smith, V. & Gallup, G.H. What the people think about their schools: Gallup's findings. Phi Delta Kappan Fastback, 1977, 94, 5-66.

Smith, V. & Gallup, G.H. The tenth annual poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 60, 33-45.

Summers, A.A. What helps fourth grade students read? A pupil-, classroom-, program-specific investigation. Research Paper No. 40, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 1979, 1-34.

Summers, A.A. & Wolfe, B.L. Which school resources help learning efficiency and equity in Philadelphia public schools? Business Review, 1975(a), 4-29.

Summers, A.A. & Wolfe, B.L. Schools do make a difference. Today's Education, November-December 1975(b), 24-27.

U.S. News and World Report, July 19, 1976, 38-39.

Walker, D.F. & Schaffarzich, J. Comparing curricula. _Review of Educational Research_, 1974, _44_, 83-111.

Woodring, P. School criticism in the 1950s and 1970s. _The Education Digest_, 1978, _44_(11), 2-5.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Norman L. Trainor was born May 25, 1940, in Borden, Indiana. He was the fourth and last child of Merle R. and Edna L. Trainor.

He attended the Wood Township Public Schools and graduated from the Wm. W. Borden High School in 1959.

His undergraduate work was at Indiana State University, Terra Haute, Indiana, where he graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in elementary education in 1964.

He received a Master of Science degree in elementary education from this same institution in 1968.

He moved to Tampa, Florida, in 1964, and has been employed by the Hillsborough County Public Schools for the past seventeen years.

In June, 1975, he received the degree Specialist in Education from the University of Florida. At that time, he elected to continue his education and received his Doctor of Education degree in December, 1980.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

James A. Hale

James A. Hale, Chairman
Professor of Educational
Administration and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

James L. Wattenbarger

James L. Wattenbarger
Professor of Educational
Administration and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Robert R. Sherman

Robert R. Sherman
Professor of Foundations of
Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of School Administration in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

December, 1980

Dean, Graduate School